FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-077
Thursday
21 April 1988

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-077 CONTENTS *21 April 1988*

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

'Mandate' Talks Resume in Vienna 20 Apr 1
Supreme Soviet Commission Approves INF Treaty 1
  Korniyenko Briefs Reporters 1
  'Concern' Over Treaty Allayed 1
  Issue of 'Future Technologies' 1
  Prospects of Strategic Accord 2
House of Representatives Approves INF Treaty 2

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Perfilyev Holds Foreign Ministry Press Briefing 3
  Shultz Visit Outlined 3
  U.S. Gulf Attack Viewed 3
  Al-Wazir Killing 'Heinous' 3
  Iran's Geneva Stance 'Negative' 4
  Joint Verification Experiment 4
  Danish Nuclear Policy Noted 4
  Turkish Cypriot Ruling Criticized 5
  Japan's Island Claims 'Illegal' 5
Vinogradov Views Japan's Persian Gulf Plans *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Apr]* 6

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Shultz Delegation Begins 4-Day Official Visit 7
  Brings 'Additional Ideas' 7
  Arrives in Moscow 7
  Agenda Outlined 7
  Talks Begin 7
  First Round Completed 8
  Spokesmen Give Joint Briefing 8
  Redman on Expectations 8
  Must Meet 'Halfway' *[Kozyakov]* 9
  U.S. Should Reply to Questions *[Karpov]* 9
  Talks Could Stimulate Progress *[Solton]* 9
Increased U.S. Gulf Involvement Deplored *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Apr]* 10
  'Military Chauvinism' in Gulf *[PRAVDA 20 Apr]* 10
  Ostalskiy Questions U.S. Action *[IZVESTIYA 20 Apr]* 11
  Actions 'Overt Aggression' *[Agayants]* 12
  'Open Disregard' for Community 12
  'Sense of Alarm' in U.S. *[IZVESTIYA 21 Apr]* 13
Visa Refusal Thwarts Kondrashov's U.S. Visit *[IZVESTIYA 20 Apr]* 13
Further Reportage on Trade Council Meeting 14
  Kamentsev, Verity Address ASTEC *[TRUD 14 Apr]* 14
  ASTEC President Interviewed *[PRAVDA 10 Apr]* 15
  Meeting Results Surveyed *[PRAVDA 16 Apr]* 16

China

National Peoples' Congress Session Ends *[IZVESTIYA 14 Apr]* 17
Growth, Benefits of Border Trade Highlighted 17

Near East & South Asia

- Pakistani Authorities Blamed for Blast *[PRAVDA 14 Apr]* 18
- Afghanistan's Amin Addresses Kabul Conference 18
- Analyst Discusses Afghan Reconciliation *[Vavilov]* 19
- Murakhovskiy Meets Afghan Commerce Minister *[PRAVDA 20 Apr]* 19
- Soviet Ship Discovers Minefield in Gulf *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 19 Apr]* 20
- 'Hitlerite Butcher' Demjanjuk Found Guilty *[PRAVDA 20 Apr]* 20

Sub-Saharan Africa

- SWAPO's Nujoma Continues Talks in Moscow 20
  - Meets Gromyko, Dobrynin 20
  - Received by Kapitsa 21
- Eritrea, Tigre Fighting 'Sharply Exacerbated' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Apr]* 21
- Mauritian Labor Party Group Visits USSR *[PRAVDA 12 Apr]* 22

East Europe

- Ryzhkov Continues Official Visit to Hungary 23
  - Talks With Kadar, Nemeth *[PRAVDA 21 Apr]* 23
  - Meets Economic Leaders *[PRAVDA 21 Apr]* 23
  - Documents Signed 23
  - Holds News Conference *[PRAVDA 21 Apr]* 24
  - Further on Remarks 26
  - 'Joint Communique' on Visit *[IZVESTITYA 21 Apr]* 27
  - Visit Evaluated 29

West Europe

- More on Supreme Soviet Delegation in Strasbourg 31
- Tolkunov To Visit Council of Europe Assembly 31
- Voss-Led Parliamentarians End Visit to Britain 31
- Kohl Submits Draft Documents on Foreign Policy 32
- Austria's Lichal Visits Moscow Military Unit *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Apr]* 32
- Zaykov Receives Italian Friendship Group Leader 32
- Belgian Report on Soviet Customs Service 33
- Supreme Soviet Group in Malta Meets Leaders 33

Latin America & Caribbean

- Further Remarks of Chile's Corvalan on Vote 34
- Chilean Student Strike Called for 28-29 Apr 37
- IPU Forum on Central America Held in Guatemala *[IZVESTIYA 14 Apr]* 37

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

- Shcherbitskiy Addresses Ukrainian Party Plenum *[Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY 9 Apr]* 38
- CPSU Adopts Decision on Party Membership *[PRAVDA 14 Apr]* 42
- Journalists Union Supports PRAVDA Article 44
- No 'Single Platform' Opposing Perestroyka Seen *[MOSCOW NEWS No 15]* 44
- RSFSR Supreme Soviet Session Opens *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 20 Apr]* 46
- RSFSR Government Appointments Reported *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 13 Apr]* 46
- RSFSR Supreme Soviet Views Housing Program 47
- Chernobyl Area Reported 'Fully Stabilized' 47
- Efforts To Combat Chernobyl Rumors Detailed *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 12 Apr]* 47
- New Nuclear Power Station Construction Planned 50
- Economic Leaders Flout Environmental Legislation *[IZVESTIYA 8 Apr]* 50
- Foreign Ministry Collegium Membership Reported *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 12]* 52

Packed Meeting Hears 'Kulak' Agronomist's Ideas *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 13 Apr]* ... 52
Veterans Attack Bestuzhov-Lada Article *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 Apr]* ... 52
TV Panel Discusses Stalin 'Crimes, Mistakes' ... 53
Briefs ... 59
    New Weekly ... 59

Economic

Dolgikh Urges Metal Consumption Reduction *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 10 Apr]* ... 60
Academicians Discuss Cooperatives Law Provisions ... 61
Economist Addresses Worries Over Price Hikes *[PRAVDA 9 Apr]* ... 61

Agricultural

Grain Farmers' Situation, 1988 Tasks Outlined *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 13 Apr]* ... 63

Scientific

'Cosmos-1939' Satellite Launched 20 Apr ... 65
Cosmonauts Carry out Astrophysical Studies ... 66
Space Program Goals Outlined on Cosmonaut Day *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Apr]* ... 66
Radio Biological Tests Under Way Near Chernobyl ... 67
Transarctic Exploration Continues From Mirny ... 68

Military

Prevalence of Draft-Dodging Attitude Discussed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 9 Apr]* ... 68

'Mandate' Talks Resume in Vienna 20 Apr

LD201218 Mosow TASS in English 1158 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] Vienna April 20 TASS—Today following a brief recess representatives of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO member nations resumed consultations in Vienna on the issue of working out a mandate for talks on the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals.

Supreme Soviet Commission Approves INF Treaty

Korniyenko Briefs Reporters

LD201301 Moscow TASS in English 1236 GMT 20 Apr 88

["Flash—Special Commission on MP's Approves INF Treaty"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow April 20 TASS—The Soviet parliament's special commission scrutinizing the Soviet-U.S. INF Treaty has concluded that its fulfilment will definitely enhance rather than reduce the security of both the two signatory nations and international security in general, commission chairman, Deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet Georgiy Korniyenko told reporters at a briefing here today.

The commission has been formed as their special working group by the foreign relations commissions of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities, the two houses of the parliament—the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

Korniyenko said that in its report to the foreign relations commissions his group had recommended them to give the USSR Supreme Soviet's Presidium a positive conclusion on the issue of ratifying the treaty.

'Concern' Over Treaty Allayed

LD210046 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 20 Apr 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] In Moscow today a briefing was held on the USSR Supreme Soviet's deliberations on the Soviet-U.S. treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles.

The commission, specially set up in the USSR Supreme Soviet for the consideration of the treaty, has been working for almost 10 weeks. Comrade Korniyenko, chairman of the commission, remarked that at the sessions, leading experts of our country and representatives of public organizations had spoken. Foreign guests were also invited. Not all responses to the treaty were uniform. Some letters sent to the commission by Soviet people expressed concern over the fact that our country will be cutting considerably more missiles. Not all are sure that one can fully trust the United States.

[Begin Korniyenko recording] The commission has considered these matters in the most careful and thorough fashion. It studied the reasons for this considerable difference in numbers. At the same time, it carefully studied the military and strategic significance of the various missiles being destroyed by both sides, as well as a number of other aspects. And in the final analysis, it came unequivocally to the conclusion that there are no objective grounds for concern regarding the consequences of the implementation of the treaty for the security of the Soviet Union and the other states of the Warsaw Pact. [end recording]

A motion that the treaty be ratified was passed. One of the questions by journalists concerned the prospects for a 50 percent reduction in strategic armaments. Could such an agreement be concluded during President Reagan's visit? Comrade Korniyenko replied that, through the fault of the U.S. side, too much time had been lost at the Geneva talks and it was difficult to make up for it, but nevertheless such a possibility should not be ruled out. Of great significance was what Secretary of State Shultz was bringing with him to our country tomorrow.

There was another question raised at the briefing. Certain foreign news agencies had reported today that before the attack on Iranian targets, the United States had consulted with the Soviet Union. A spokesman for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs rebutted these assertions. The United States had informed our country, but this was after the attack.

Issue of 'Future Technologies'

LD201419 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1308 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow, 20 Apr (TASS)—In the work of the Preparatory Commission—the working body of the commissions for foreign affairs of the Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities—special attention has been paid to the question of the correspondence of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles to the security interests of the USSR and its allies, Georgiy Korniyenko, chairman of the Preparatory Commission, deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet, said today. He was speaking at the Press Center of the USSR Foreign Ministry on today's final session of the commission.

At the same time, G. Korniyenko continued, account was taken of the fact that, alongside the undisputed overwhelmingly approving attitude of Soviet people toward the treaty, among some of them is arising a certain vagueness and worry, chiefly over the fact that the USSR will have to destroy a larger number of missiles than the United States while British and French missiles are not taken into account at all. "Having given overall consideration to all the data concerning this problem," the chairman of the Preparatory Commission stressed, "we have come to the conclusion that there are no objective reasons for unease here. Implementation of the Soviet-U.S. treaty eliminating intermediate- and shorter-range missiles will undoubtedly not weaken, but on the contrary enhance, the security of those directly party to it, and overall international security."

The Preparatory Commission has also arrived at favorable conclusions on other aspects of the treaty it examined, G. Korniyenko noted. This is why a report for the foreign affairs commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers recommends giving the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium a positive conclusion on the issue of ratifying the treaty.

At the same time, the report notes the justified concern of Soviet people in connection with NATO plans under examination "to compensate" for the U.S. missiles in Europe that are being liquidated via modernization and stockpiling of other nuclear means. Implementation of such plans would undermine the meaning of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles as the first step toward nuclear disarmament.

Replying to journalists, the commission chairman said the question that arose when the U.S. Senate was examining the INF Treaty was also examined: whether the ban extends to intermediate- and shorter-range missiles that could be equipped with warheads created on some kind of future technologies. "The commission has been officially briefed by the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the USSR Ministry of Defense that the Soviet side has an identical understanding of this issue with the U.S. Administration. We unambiguously proceed from the fact that, according to the treaty on liquidation of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, missiles of these two classes are subject to a ban regardless of their equipment: nuclear or nonnuclear. This, our point of view, has been conveyed to the U.S. side, G. Korniyenko underlined.

Prospects of Strategic Accord

LD201501 Moscow TASS in English 1440 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 20 TASS—"Much time has been lost, regrettably. Lost by the American side," Georgiy Korniyenko told a briefing here today, replying to a correspondent's question about prospects of drafting a treaty on the limitation of strategic offensive arms by the beginning of the Moscow summit.

He was speaking in the capacity of chairman of the Preparatory Commission, a working body of the foreign affairs commissions of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities at the USSR Supreme Soviet.

In December last year, Korniyenko said, the Soviet Union noticed at the Geneva talks that the American side was unprepared to move forward at a pace that would make it possible to prepare the instruments for signing during the Soviet-American summit in Moscow.

Nevertheless, the commission chairman pointed out, "one cannot rule out the possibility. Much will depend on what U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz will bring to Moscow on April 21.

"If he comes with a baggage that makes it possible to complete work within the period remaining before the meeting, the USSR is ready for that."

House of Representatives Approves INF Treaty

LD201019 Moscow TASS in English 0930 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] Washington April 20 TASS—TASS correspondent I. Ignatiyev reports:

The U.S. House of Representatives on Tuesday by an overwhelming majority of votes declared in support of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles which was signed at the summit in Washington in December last year. Three hundred and ninety-three congressmen stated their approval of the historic treaty. Only seven voted against it.

The voting on the INF Treaty in the U.S. House of Representatives is of only symbolic importance, for under the American Constitution only the U.S. Senate has a prerogative right to express an approval of or objections to international agreements concluded by the United States. However, the wide support for the treaty shown during the voting reflects the opinion of a majority of Americans. It is also of importance that the U.S. House of Representatives decided to express its attitude to the INF Treaty before full Senate officially begins to discuss it.

A Senate debate on the INF Treaty is not expected to commence earlier than the beginning of May. Nevertheless, Howard Baker, the White House chief of staff, on Tuesday voiced the opinion that the treaty would be endorsed by the upper house of Congress before President Reagan leaves for Moscow to attend a new Soviet-American summit meeting.

Perfilyev Holds Foreign Ministry Press Briefing

Shultz Visit Outlined

LD201338 Moscow TASS in English 1333 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 20 TASS—It has been agreed that the visit to the Soviet Union by the U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz will begin on April 21, a press briefing here today was told by Vadim Perfilyev, deputy head of the USSR Foreign Ministry's Information Directorate. He said that George Shultz will be received by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev.

The course of preparations for the new Soviet-American summit will be discussed during the talks between member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR Eduard Shevardnadze and the U.S. secretary of state. They will also continue discussions of a wide range of questions of relations between the two countries and key international problems.

After completing his talks in Moscow George Shultz will visit Kiev and Tbilisi where he will have meetings with the leaders of the Ukraine and Georgia, the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said further. In Kiev the programme of the visit includes an inspection of buildings made available for the U.S. Consulate General. There is an agreement in principle on the opening in that city of a U.S. Consulate General simultaneously with the opening of a Soviet Consulate General in New York.

U.S. Gulf Attack Viewed

LD201541 Moscow TASS in English 1531 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 20 TASS—The incident involving the American frigate Samuel B. Roberts, damaged by a mine, has again confirmed that the massive presence of Western navies in the Gulf did not in any way contribute to greater safety of navigation, Vadim Perfilyev, deputy head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Information Directorate, told a briefing here today.

"Moveover, it posed a threat that the situation might break out of control and become unpredictable," he added.

The U.S. actions in the Gulf against Iran which followed the frigate incident, no matter what their causes, were enhancing the explosive character of the situation, rather than normalizing it, Perfilyev said.

The power methods used in the Gulf today, he observed, belonged to the past of relations between states. What required [as received] nowadays was not the diplomacy of power, but the power of diplomacy.

"The Soviet Union expects that the United States, like the other parties involved in the conflict, would analyse the current dangerous situation, display restraint and common sense and refrain from actions leading to the further aggravation of the situation in the Gulf."

Asked by a TASS correspondent about the Soviet assessment of the American warship attack against Iranian oil platforms, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman emphasised that the Soviet Union views that action as a gross violation of international law and total disregard for world public opinion.

"The United States, by such actions in the Gulf, seriously complicates the search for political ways of settling the Iran-Iraq conflict. These actions damage the constructive and sensible handling of the problem at a time when positive trends have become visible in this field."

The Soviet spokesman reaffirmed that the United States had informed the Soviet Union about its action. "This was done, however, after the strike. To say that the United States consulted the Soviet Union would be an ill-intentioned distortion of facts," Perfilyev pointed out.

Al-Wazir Killing 'Heinous'

LD201531 Moscow TASS in English 1449 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 20 TASS—The news about the heinous killing of Abu Jihad [Khalil al-Wazir], a prominent Palestinian figure, in Tunis outraged and pained Soviet people, a spokesman for the Soviet Foreign Ministry said.

Vadim Perfilyev, deputy head of the Ministry's Information Directorate, said at a briefing today that people in the Soviet Union shared the grief of Palestinians who had lost one more fighter for the restoration of their rights trampled under foot.

"The political motives for the killing are clear," he said. "The murderers were directed by those who are not interested in a just solution of most complicated problems that have accumulated in the Middle East over the decades of the conflict situation, by those who would like to prevent the exercise by the Palestinian people of their national rights, above all the right to self-determination, and to extend, if not perpetuate, the Israeli occupation of Palestinian and other Arab lands."

"The Soviet Union holds that this crime is a manifestation of terrorism which it resolutely denounces.

"This terrorist act was intended to provoke a new flareup of violence and divert the struggle of Palestinians, who have started a veritable people's uprising against Israeli invaders, from the road of political settlement," the spokesman said.

Iran's Geneva Stance 'Negative'

LD201651 Moscow TASS in English 1612 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 20 TASS—"The political settlement of external aspects of the 'Afghan problem' reached by the conclusion of the Geneva accords has undoubtedly broken a chain of regional conflicts," a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman told a briefing here today.

Vadim Perfilyev, deputy head of the ministry's Information Directorate, said that the specific success of new political thinking was achieved not only thanks to the efforts of the states that strove for that and were directly involved in the settlement, but also thanks to the countries which, guided by political realism, created a favourable atmosphere for attaining these accords.

The settlement of external aspects of the Afghan problem would undoubtedly have a positive effect on the process of national reconciliation in Afghanistan and the formation of a coalition government with the participation of all the forces representing Afghan society, including those who were currently opposed to one another.

"Restoring the Afghan economy and developing the social square will require great external aid," Perfilyev said. "The USSR will extend appropriate assistance to the Republic of Afghanistan. Afghanistan maintains extensive ties with other socialist countries.

"A programme of economic assistance to Afghanistan along the U.N. lines is being developed."

The USSR noted with satisfaction the positive reaction to the agreements on the political settlement of the situation relating to Afghanistan from the governments and socio-political circles in Finland and Sweden.

"This reaction is important," he said, "because both countries are assigned an essential role in facilitating the implementation of the Geneva accords by directing their representatives to U.N. groups of inspectors.

"These countries can also extend humanitarian aid in connection with the return of Afghan refugees."

The Iranian Foreign Ministry's statement expressing a negative attitude to the Geneva agreements was in striking discord. "Iran's position cannot but cause regret," Perfilyev said. "If Iran made its contribution to assisting the Afghan settlement, all countries in the region, including Iran itself, would benefit.

"It is perfectly clear that Iran's current stance cannot hinder the political settlement on the basis of the Geneva agreements.

"This process, which enjoys extensive international support, would deepen and gain momentum."

"One would like to think that Iran has not as yet said its final word," the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman pointed out in conclusion.

Joint Verification Experiment

LD201714 Moscow TASS in English 1647 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 20 TASS—"Work on preparing a joint Soviet-American verification experiment at the test sites in Semipalatinsk and Nevada is continuing," a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman told a briefing here today.

On April 18, an American military-transport plane brought to Semipalatinsk a first group of U.S. experts along with necessary equipment to prepare a joint experiment.

Seven Soviet experts were already working at the Nevada test site, said Vadim Perfilyev, deputy head of the ministry's Information Directorate.

The landing of the U.S. Air Force plane at a civilian airport in Semipalatinsk followed an exchange of notes between the Soviet and American delegations to the Soviet-American full-scale talks on nuclear testing-related issues.

The agreement to conduct a joint verification experiment, Perfilyev observed, was formulated in the December 9, 1987 statement by the Soviet Foreign Ministry and the U.S. secretary of state.

The sides agreed to enable respective partners in the experiment to measure one-two explosions with a yield not less than 100 kilotons and approaching 150 kt.

Each side will be able to use both teleseismic and hydrodynamic methods.

The aim of the joint experiment is to create groundwork for adopting a decision on verification measures which the USSR and the United States will use to check compliance with the threshold test ban treaty of 1974 and the peaceful nuclear explosions treaty of 1976.

"Elaborating improved verification measures to check compliance with the treaties is the principal objective of the full-scale negotiations between the USSR and the United States," said the Soviet spokesman. "Their ultimate goal is to achieve a total ban on testing."

Danish Nuclear Policy Noted

LD201845 Moscow TASS in English 1821 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 20 TASS—The Soviet-Swedish agreement on the delimitation of the continental shelf, which was signed in Moscow, has settled the problem which for almost two decades marred relations between the two countries, Vadim Perfilyev, deputy director of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, told a briefing here today.

Both the USSR and Sweden stand to gain from the settlement of the problem, he emphasized. The other Baltic countries also stand to gain from it since they can now rest assured that the depletion of the fish resources in a considerable part of the Baltic will be ended.

Touching upon the resolution recently passed by the Danish Folketing urging the governments to notify foreign naval ships that Denmark does not accept nuclear weapons in its territory, including ports, Vadim Perfilyev stressed: "We have always respected Denmark's non-nuclear policy. In our view it is a noticeable contribution to strengthening stability in the north of Europe, and consequently, the European security as a whole."

The Soviet Union will be prepared to guarantee that there are no nuclear weapons on board the Soviet naval ships calling at Denmark's ports, the spokesman for the USSR Foreign Ministry said.

Vadim Perfilyev has described the report issued by USIA on USSR's so-called "active measures" in the field of information as a "a malicious attempt at slandering USSR's foreign policy, at discrediting perestroyka, the drive for more democracy and openness currently under way in the Soviet Union". "To all appearances," the spokesman for the USSR Foreign Ministry said, "the main objective of the authors of the report was to prevent a growth of trust in Soviet-American relations, renunciation of the enemy image". "This fraud can only cause indignation, the more so that it has been set afloat on the eve of the new important events in Soviet-American relations."

The briefing was told that Igor Rogachev, USSR deputy foreign minister, held political consultations in Malaysia, Indonesia and Thailand from April 6 to 18. During the meetings and conversations, which were held in a friendly atmosphere, views were exchanged on a broad range of international and regional problems, questions were discussed pertaining to the state of and prospects for the development of bilateral relations.

Yuliy Vorontsov, USSR first deputy foreign minister, is to go on a visit to Turkey on April 26-30. In the course of the visit it is planned to discuss not only issues pertaining to bilateral relations, but also the most important international problems, the briefing was told.

Turkish Cypriot Ruling Criticized

LD201509 Moscow TASS in English 1446 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 20 TASS—The administration of the Turkish community in Cyprus has introduced a new procedure, in effect from April 15, for crossing the "Green Line" dividing the two communities designed to confirm the existence of an alleged state border of the Turkish Cypriot separatist "state entity," Vadim Perfilyev, deputy head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Information Directorate, told a briefing here today.

He recalled that the proclamation of "independence" of that "state entity" in 1983 was assessed as null and void by the U.N. Security Council (Resolution 541/83 of November 18, 1983).

In our opinion, said the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman, the latest action by the Turkish Cypriot administration contributed to the preservation and deepening of the actual division of Cyprus by creating new artificial barriers in the way of the rapprochement between the two Cypriot communities and the re-establishment of trust between them.

This step contradicted the trends towards the normalization of the situation in the eastern Mediterranean and ran against basic principles of the peaceful political settlement of regional conflicts which proved convincingly their efficiency on the example of the settlement of the situation relating to Afghanistan.

"The Soviet Union has always consistently condemned any actions which might heighten the situation in Cyprus," said the Soviet spokesman. "The latest step by the Turkish Cypriot administration is just such type of action."

Japan's Island Claims 'Illegal'

LD202040 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1439 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow, 20 Apr (TASS)—"A ritual designed to heat up the revanchist campaign of territorial claims on the USSR" is how Vadim Perfilyev, deputy chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry's Information Directorate, described here today Japanese Foreign Minister Sosuke Uno's visit to Hokkaido. It was undertaken on 17 April with the aim of a visual inspection of the so-called "northern territories," as the southern part of the Soviet Kurile Islands are called in Japan; Tokyo has illegal and ungrounded claims on them. The Soviet side, the Soviet Foreign Ministry representative noted, has more than once set out its principled assessment of those claims and of the propaganda campaign being artificially developed over them in Japan, and there is no need to to repeat it again.

In this instance, however, one's attention is drawn to the unprecedentedly challenging and militant nature of the statements made by Sosuke Uno at a news conference following the "inspection." In particular, according to a Japanese radio broadcast in Russian, the minister asserted categorically that "an end to the illegal occupation of these islands is near." If the report on Japanese radio corresponds to reality, said V. Perfilyev, then it is difficult to describe the minister's declaration as anything other than irresponsible. It is all the more bewildering because it strikes a clearly discordant note with Japan's intention which he also expressed on Hokkaido, to expand and deepen dialogue with the Soviet Union.

"Declarations like this can in no way promote an improvement in Soviet-Japanese relations or the development of constructive dialogue between the two countries," the USSR Foreign Ministry representative stressed.

Vinogradov Views Japan's Persian Gulf Plans

PM210843 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Apr 88 Second Edition p 3

[V. Vinogradov "Rejoinder": "Latterday Samurai in the Persian Gulf"]

[Text] A report has just been published in Tokyo by the Center for Strategic Studies. This organization, which brings together many deputies of the ruling Liberal Democratic Party and retired generals and serves as a kind of "think tank" for Japanese hawks, plays a highly important role in military policy-making. For example, the report demands Japanese minesweepers be sent to the Persian Gulf after the law on the "self-defense forces" has been reviewed for this purpose.

The writers of the report thus call directly for revision of the existing legislation in order to lift the ban on the sending of Japanese forces abroad. After all, it was precisely that clause which prevented the Japanese Government last October meeting the Washington administration's request and sending warships to the Persian Gulf. True, to sweeten the bitter "pill" for Washington, Tokyo did then announce a number of measures of "indirect support" for U.S. actions in the region. It increased, for example, its expenditure on maintaining Pentagon bases on Japanese territory so that the Pentagon could use the funds released to finance "escort" operations in the Persian Gulf.

However, it is impossible not to see that official Tokyo is at the same time increasingly in de facto breach of the existing ban. Japan's participation in the large-scale, multilateral Rimpac naval maneuvers is a case in point. This will be the fifth time, for example, that Japanese ships and aircraft will be participating in the military maneuvers, which are to be held this June-July in the region of Hawaii. Tokyo's decision to assign its Navy and Air Force the task of "blockading" international straits in the Far East in the case of an emergency and "defending" sea and air lanes within a 1,000-mile zone around Japanese shores is also a violation.

But, as we can see, some people in the Japanese capital are not averse to pushing the lines of such "defense" still further. It is no wonder, then, that representatives of the Japanese ruling circles openly talk about "defensive" aircraft carriers, the possession of which, it is claimed, would not be forbidden by the Constitution—although even Prime Minister N. Takeshita himself has been unable to explain to opposition deputies how a "defensive" aircraft carrier differs from an offensive one. But Admiral S. Higashiyama, Navy chief of staff, has been frank and has bluntly stated that "the possession of aircraft carriers will enable us to think in broader categories."

But are these not the same categories that guided samurai when they invaded a number of Southeast Asian states during World War II and committed bloody crimes there? That is why the desire of these latterday samurai to see Japanese warships in a region as distant from their own archipelago as the Persian Gulf is bound to cause alarm.

United States & Canada

Shultz Delegation Begins 4-Day Official Visit

Brings 'Additional Ideas'

LD201722 Moscow TASS in English 1706 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] Helsinki April 20 TASS—U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, who made a one-day stop-over in Helsinki on his way to the Soviet Union, told a press conference here today that the United States and the Soviet Union had made moderate progress towards concluding a treaty on the 50-per cent reduction of strategic nuclear arms.

The American delegation, Shultz said, was going to Moscow with some additional ideas. He expressed the hope that progress would be achieved at the forthcoming talks. The sides would continue work with a view to attaining the agreement, he said.

Arrives in Moscow

LD210627 Moscow TASS in English 0618 GMT 21 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 21 TASS—U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz arrived in Moscow from Helsinki today in keeping with the existing agreement. He is accompanied by Colin Powell, assistant to the president for national security affairs, and other officials. They were met by Yuliy Vorontsov, first deputy foreign minister of the USSR, and Soviet ambassador to the USA Yuriy Dubinin.

During the visit to the USSR the U.S. secretary of state will be received by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and hold talks with Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze. During the talks they will discuss preparations for a new Soviet-U.S. summit, and continue reviewing a wide range of Soviet-U.S. issues and a number of other problems.

George Shultz and his party are expected to spend four days in the Soviet Union. On April 23-24 the U.S. secretary of state will visit Kiev and Tbilisi where he will meet with the heads of the Ukraine and Georgia.

Agenda Outlined

LD210745 Moscow TASS in English 0632 GMT 21 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 21 TASS—TASS diplomatic correspondent Vadim Biryukov writes:

U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz arrived here today, in accordance with the existing understanding, for a regular stage of the Soviet-American dialogue the results of which the world public is looking forward to. Preparations for the forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting here, scheduled for May 29-June 2, are at the centre of attention during the current visit of the U.S. secretary of state.

The entire spectrum of Soviet-American relations, including arms limitation and reductions, human rights, regional issues, and matters concerning bilateral relations, is expected to be actively discussed in the coming two days. However, the main thing which is uppermost in everyone's mind is whether the Soviet and American sides will succeed in preparing by the time of the Moscow summit a draft treaty on a 50 per cent reduction in strategic offensive arms (S.T.A.R.T.) with compliance with the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972.

"Unfortunately, much time, which could have been used for the preparation of such a draft, was let slip by the American side," Georgiy Korniyenko, first deputy head of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee, said in this connection at a briefing on Wednesday.

"At the talks in Geneva lately the Soviet side encountered the USA's unpreparedness to work at such a pace so as to prepare a draft treaty in time. However, I do not rule out the possibility that there is still time to prepare it. All depends on how constructive proposals brought to Moscow by George Shultz will be".

It is believed among diplomatic circles in Moscow that the summit meeting here will undoubtedly take a worthy place in the history of Soviet-American relations. However, for it to become a major event in Soviet-American efforts to curb the arms race and a big [words indistinct] it is essential to make every effort and to work constructively as much as possible so that the meeting is crowned with the signing of a S.T.A.R.T. treaty.

Talks Begin

LD210733 Moscow TASS in English 0727 GMT 21 Apr 88

[text] Moscow April 21 TASS—A regular round of the Soviet-American talks has just begun at the Foreign Ministry's mansion on Aleksey Tolstoy Street in downtown Moscow where a motorcade arrived from Sheremetyevo Airport.

U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz entered the mansion, which is well familiar to him, as "an old hand"—this is already his 25th meeting with Eduard Shevardnadze, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR (the previous one was held in Geneva on April 14 on the day of the signing of the agreements on resolving the foreign aspects of the Afghanistan situation).

Many of the meetings, specifically those held in Moscow, took place on Aleksey Tolstoy Street.

The Soviet partners for the talks greeted the U.S. Secretary of State and his party with whom they had become well acquainted over the past two years.

The Soviet-American meeting began with a plenary meeting of the two delegations.

Subsequently, there will be meetings between the two foreign ministers in a narrow format, as well as expert group meetings.

The diplomatic circles of the Soviet capital do not rule out the possibility that the elaboration of documents on a reduction in strategic offensive arms will be completed so that they could be signed during the forthcoming Moscow meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan.

Very much depends on what the U.S. secretary of state has brought with him to the USSR today. If he has arrived with a "baggage" which will make it possible to complete the work within the period remaining before the summit, the Soviet Union is ready for that.

First Round Completed

LD211155 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 21 Apr 88

[Text] In Moscow, the Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and the U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz have completed the first round of their talks. The Soviet ambassador in the United States, Yuriy Dubinin, who is taking part in the talks, has told our correspondent that the main subject of the talks was preparations for the Soviet-American summit.

Reductions in strategic offensive weapons of the Soviet Union and the United States in the context of an observance of the ABM Treaty, ban on nuclear testing, and regional conflicts were also discussed. An important part of the talks are humanitarian issues and, of course, Yuriy Dubinin added, the attention of the two sides is focused on bilateral relations.

Spokesmen Give Joint Briefing

LD211535 Moscow TASS in English 1518 GMT 21 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 21 TASS—Soviet-American meetings on the level of foreign ministers have become a tradition. They are held in a businesslike and constructive atmosphere. This is the unanimous opinion of Vadim Perfilyev, USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman, and Charles Redman, spokesman for the U.S. Department of State, who spoke at a briefing here today about the talks between Eduard Shevardnadze and George Shultz started in Moscow.

"One can state that meetings of the ministers are not only held in a favourable atmosphere, but also bring good results", Vadim Perfilyev said. "Significant positive changes took place recently in Soviet-American relations. Difficult work at the INF Treaty regarded with good reason as a breakthrough in a real disarmament process has been completed. Foundation has been laid for a 50 per cent reduction of strategic offensive armaments in conditions of the observance and preservation of the ABM Treaty. Progress has been achieved in the solution of the problem of discontinuation of nuclear tests. Broader prospects have opened up in the sphere of global banning and elimination of chemical weapons and the reduction of conventional armaments". [TASS in English at 1350 GMT broadcasts a similar report on Perfilyev's remarks and adds: "'In our opinion, our future work, including future summit meetings, will depend a great deal on the outcome of this meeting which is undoubtedly a major event in Soviet-American relations and world politics in general', Vadim Perfilyev said."]

Tasks connected with humanitarian cooperation and human rights are discussed in a constructive atmosphere. Much attention is devoted to regional problems on which certain progress has been achieved of late. The USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman recalled that agreements on Afghanistan had been signed in Geneva several days before. The foreign ministers of the two countries took an active part in it: They put their signatures under those documents.

Charles Redman said that the current meeting between George Shultz and Eduard Shevardnadze is one of a series of such meetings held rather intensively in the course of 1988. Their purpose is to prepare a summit meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan. Much remains to be done. The Moscow summit will be very important, and both sides expect it to be held in a spirit of a constructive dialogue. There is no doubt that the ministers will seek to achieve progress ahead of the summit, the Department of State spokesman pointed out.

It was reported at the briefing that by tradition after the first plenary meeting working groups had been formed—on strategic offensive armaments and anti-ballistic missile defense, on a nulcear test ban, on chemical weapons, on conventional weapons, on regional problems, on humanitarian issues and on bilateral relations.

Redman on Expectations

LD211341 Moscow TASS in English 1327 GMT 21 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 21 TASS—This meeting of the U.S. Secretary of State Shultz and the Foreign Minister of the USSR Eduard Shevardnadze is one of the meetings which have been intensively held during 1988. Their aim is preparation for the Mikhail Gorbachev-Ronald Reagan summit, said here Charles Redman, a representative of the U.S. Department of State.

Speaking at a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists at the press centre of the USSR Foreign Ministry today, he has said that the U.S. secretary of state and the foreign minister of the USSR are to do a great volume of work. The forthcoming Moscow summit meeting is very important and both sides expect it to be held in the spirit of a constructive dialogue. The U.S. secretary of state and the foreign minister of the USSR will be striving for progress on the eve of the summit meeting, said Charles Redman.

Must Meet 'Halfway'

LD210252 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] Secretary of State Shultz begins talks with Soviet leaders in Moscow on Thursday. This is part of preparations for the summit next month. Commentary is by our observer Vladislav Kozyakov. Here is what he writes:

The meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan which is to take place from 29 May to 2 June in Moscow will be the fourth in the past 4 and 1/2 years. The three previous ones, in Geneva, Reykjavik, and Washington, have demonstrated how increasingly productive the Soviet-American dialogue has become. The treaty on eliminating medium- and shorter-range missiles signed in Washington last December marks the beginning of the destruction of nuclear arsenals, and that is for the first time in history. As for the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan, their guarantors are the Soviet Union and the United States, who have set an example of constructive mutual action of the two countries.

Noticeable progress has been made also in other spheres. For instance, in extending contacts and promoting humanitarian cooperation. The same can be said about economic contacts. This is borne out by the participation of more than 500 American businessmen in a recent meeting in Moscow of the American-Soviet Trade and Economic Council. What has been achieved gives rise to optimism and the hope that the coming summit will help to elevate cooperation to a new level, and first of all in such an important field as nuclear disarmament. And that problem will without any doubt be figuring prominently at the talks which begin in Moscow on Thursday with the participation of the American secretary of state. On the eve of the discussions, everybody is naturally interested in what George Shultz will bring with him to Moscow. As for the draft documents on reducing by half strategic arms in the context of complying with the ABM Treaty, it is said that there is still no agreement on the 1,200 provisions. About half of them are technical ones which could be solved. The other half deals with the complicated problems of control, verification and calculations.

All that still has to be worked out, though at the meeting between George Shultz and Eduard Shevardnadze in March, the Soviet side made quite a number of concrete proposals, meeting the other side half way. However, there has been no reply to many of them in the one month that has passed. American press reports don't sound optimistic. THE WASHINGTON POST on Tuesday quoted U.S. officials as saying that the secretary of state was going to Moscow without any new concrete proposals which would help solve the problems blocking agreement on reducing strategic arms. And only a little more than a month remains till the new summit. Only by meeting each other half way can new agreements on disarmament be prepared and then signed during President Reagan's visit to Moscow.

U.S. Should Reply to Questions

LD211308 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1242 GMT 21 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow, 21 Apr (TASS)—"The task of the current Soviet-U.S. dialogue is to determine the content of the Moscow summit meeting due to be held from 28 May to 2 June," said Viktor Karpov, head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Department for Arms and Disarmament Problems, in an interview with a TASS diplomatic correspondent today. "There is one essential condition for the fulfillment of this task; namely, that the U.S. side should reply to the questions raised by us with them on key questions of international relations."

"We are awaiting with impatience the moment when it will become clear what political baggage George Shultz, the secretary of state, brought to Moscow with him," said Viktor Karpov. "From the results of the first half-day of talks, it is difficult to speak of any kind of progress on the problems of nuclear missile disarmament, since, as before, the discussion has been mainly on humanitarian problems. This is only part of the agenda for the visit of the U.S. secretary of state to Moscow, and furthermore, in my opinion, not the most important."

Talks Could Stimulate Progress

LD211337 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 21 Apr 88

[Text] The Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and the United States Secretary of State George Shultz have begun talks in Moscow. The two men are preparing another Soviet-American summit. Here is commentary by Yuriy Solton:

The political dialogue between the leaders of such nations as the Soviet Union and the United States is important in itself. If discussion is sincere, it is useful. It will help solve complicated problems that face not only the Soviet Union and the United States. It would be great if Mikhail Gorbachev's fourth meeting with Ronald Reagan produced tangible results.

Primarily in the field of disarmament, now that the Soviet Union and the United States have signed a treaty to get rid of their medium- and shorter-range missiles, the next step is an agreement that would reduce by half the two nations' strategic offensive arms, with the observance of the ABM Treaty. Many are asking if an agreement of this kind will be prepared for the Moscow summit to sign. I disagree with the pessimists who say no. There's nothing to worry about, to my mind, that papers keep saying that the 1,200 formulas in the documents remain to be coordinated. Firstly, half of them are purely technical; and secondly, if the two sides abide by the parameters that were set at the Washington summit last December, they can solve the other half of the problem.

I believe it would be wrong to rule out the possibility of completing the documents for the Moscow summit to sign them. True, it's an alarming sign that the American delegation has slowed down, but I do believe the current talks in Moscow between Shevardnadze and Shultz will stimulate progress. To be frank, the latest few statements by the American President and his men have led people to doubt what the United States calls its sincere wish to see compromise. Although high-ranking administration officials claim they set much store by the forthcoming summit, they have all of a sudden begun to lay rude claims to the Soviet Union.

They keep saying the United States can only force the Soviets to move towards a relaxation of military tension. It's anyone's guess why they need such an anti-Soviet action—to conceal the problems facing the United States or play up to the warmongers in the United States and other NATO countries? Anyway, an action of this kind can hardly help improve the international situation. I do believe Eduard Shevardnadze's talks with George Shultz will help clear up this important aspect of Soviet-American relations.

Increased U.S. Gulf Involvement Deplored

PM211337 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Apr 88 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Persian Gulf: Pentagon Rattles the Saber"]

[Text] New York, 20 Apr—The Reagan administration is examining the question of expanding the U.S. military presence in the Persian Gulf region and increasing the tasks facing the U.S. Armed Forces, THE NEW YORK TIMES has reported, citing White House, Pentagon, and State Department spokesmen. In the newspaper's words, the Pentagon is "studying the possibility of changes in the U.S. Armed Forces' operations in the Gulf in favor of expanding the U.S. role in this region."

The National Security Council and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the NBC television company notes, are examining measures to "step up the defense" of oil platforms and tankers belonging to U.S. allies, and also the prospects for sending additional armed forces contingents to the region. A Pentagon spokesman confirmed that the United States "is now reassessing the situation in the Persian Gulf and the thrust of its policy in this region."

President Reagan asserted at a meeting held at the White House with the Republican leaders in Congress that now the Gulf situation "would seem to be calming down." In a message to Congress, the President stated that the United States believes that the "question is closed." At the same time he stressed that the U.S. Navy should remain in the Persian Gulf and be ready to "take any additional actions."

Official White House spokesman M. Fitzwater denied reports Tuesday that the United States is suspending an operation to escort Kuwaiti tankers through the Persian Gulf. "There has been no change in our position on escorts," Fitzwater stated. But, as THE NEW YORK TIMES reported, U.S. ships are not accompanying any vessels at all in the Gulf. Merchant ships are being discouraged from entering the Persian Gulf, the CBS television company says, inasmuch as it is "still too dangerous."

Assessments on the White House decision to once again launch a military force in the Persian Gulf are far from unanimous. Speaking on Capitol Hill, J. Traficant, a member of the House of Representatives, demanded the immediate invoking of the War Powers Act, which provides for the automatic withdrawal of U.S. forces from regions of combat operations within 60 days unless Congress decides otherwise. But President Reagan continues to assert that there is no justification for applying the War Powers Act.

Mohammad Ja'far Mahallati, Iranian acting permanent representative at the United Nations, fiercely condemned the United States for attacking Iranian oil platforms in the Persian Gulf.

'Military Chauvinism' in Gulf

PM201249 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Apr 88 Second Edition p 1, 5

[Own correspondent Vitaliy Gan report: "On the Brink"]

[Text] Washington, 19 Apr—From very early morning till late evening, life in Washington was dominated by "the war." Dawn had not yet broken in the U.S. capital when White House spokesman M. Fitzwater called an urgent news conference to announce America's "response measures" against Iran.

At around 0800 hours, Defense Secretary Carlucci and Admiral Crowe, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, held a joint news conference in the Pentagon. The news conferences, briefings, speeches, and consultations with the Congress continued all day, and only nightfall in the Persian Gulf, which is ahead of Washington time, "called" a time-out in the frenzied activity on the Potomac.

The result of the day's activity, marked by a most serious U.S.-Iran armed clash, is known only in terms of the two sides' materiel. Asserting its right to a presence in the Persian Gulf by means of the "mailed fist," the Pentagon destroyed two Iranian oil platforms, sank or put out of action six Iranian warships, and possibly damaged one fighter-bomber. For their part, the Iranians set alight an oil platform where U.S. service workers were present, attacked U.S. Navy ships and planes, and also hit a British tanker and a Cypriot freighter. As usual, the calculation of the casualties is left to last. However, it is already clear that the United States has omitted a helicopter with a two-man crew. Iran's losses have not been announced yet, either.

The fighting, which affected virtually all of the Persian Gulf, was by no means spontaneous. U.S. officials admit that the White House and the National Security Council had begun planning a "retaliatory strike" as far back as last Friday when the U.S. frigate "Samuel B. Roberts" hit a mine in the Gulf. As a result, 10 crew members were injured. Thirsting for vengeance, the U.S. Administration decided to "teach" Iran "a lesson," even though it was not known for sure to whom the mine belonged.

By Saturday the action plan was outlined, and Reagan ratified it when he returned from Camp David on Sunday. Realizing that they were dealing with a major military operation, the President and his advisers decided to notify the congressional leadership so as to avoid "domestic policy costs." Shortly before midnight, the President signed the order freeing the Pentagon's hands.

Dubbed the "worst day's violence" in the Persian Gulf, this April Monday brought the country to the very brink of a real war. Despite its superiority—the United States now has one cruiser, four destroyers, and seven frigates in the Gulf plus an aircraft carrier group near the entrance to the Gulf against three old Iranian destroyers, two frigates, and a number of missile and patrol vessels—the Pentagon was taken aback, as its spokesmen have admitted, by the force of the Iranian resistance. This means that to avoid similar "suprises" next time, Washington will not limit itself to "actions below full strength."

By all accounts, such a turn of events is to be expected. It is reported that in addition to today's operation, plans have already been prepared for the total destruction of the Iranian Navy. "We undertook this action to convince the Iranians that they should not harbor any illusions about the price of behaving irresponsibly.... If they threaten us, they will pay for it," President Reagan stated categorically.

Gratified that the administration has departed from its usual practice and held preliminary consultations with it, Congress is supporting the White House at the moment. In an outburst of militarist chauvinism, the legislators are applauding the president's "justified response," "bravery," and so forth. Only a few people are showing the common sense which forces them to consider the very dangerous consequences of the U.S. actions in the Persian Gulf, many thousands of kilometers from America's borders. "It is absolutely clear that we found ourselves in a very dangerous situation," Senator J. McCain says.

Washington's armed interference in the region threatens an explosion which will be heard far beyond the Persian Gulf itself.

Ostalskiy Questions U.S. Action

PM201251 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Apr 88 Morning Edition p 5

[A. Ostalskiy "Rejoinder" under the rubric "Facts, Events, Opinions": "Recurrence of Strong-Arm Tactics"]

[Text] What would inevitably have happened sooner or later has happened: Real hostilities have flared up between the United States and Iran in the Persian Gulf.

On Monday the U.S. secretary of defense reported that the U.S. President had given orders to U.S. forces to carry out "strikes against Iranian military units and subunits in the Persian Gulf."

But there is something strange about this: Reagan's order was concerned with Iranian military targets, but the first strikes were made against strictly civilian targets—two large Iranian oil platforms. Iranian ships hit at the time were merely trying to defend these platforms, on which totally innocent civilians—Iranian workers and specialists—were coming under fire from U.S. guns. What law permitted the U.S. President to essentially sentence them to death, and for what "crimes"?

Even if one allows that the mine that damaged the American ship "Samuel B. Roberts" last Thursday was indeed Iranian, can one really tolerate action guided by the principle of "an eye for an eye" in these complex international conditions?

Of course, the problem of ensuring freedom of navigation in the Persian Gulf does exist and must be solved. It must be recognized that Iranian attacks on vessels from third countries create an obstacle and a threat to this navigation. The main source of tension is still the Iran-Iraq war, which has continued for almost 8 years.

But we must ask ourselves the question: Will a massive American military presence and the use of force help in any way to solve any of these problems? Navigation—this is proved indisputably by world insurance company reports alone—has become several times more dangerous since several dozen American ships made their appearance in the region. Attacks on ships from third countries have become considerably more frequent. The situation on the Iran-Iraq front has been further exacerbated.

It turns out that the American military presence is needed only to demonstrate U.S. might once again and to make clear U.S. determination to resort to any measures to keep the Persian Gulf in the "sphere of Western influence."

So what is this: a recurrence of "neoglobalism," another "die" cast by the U.S. far right, which dreams of new American "Grenadas" and "Libyas"?

"Strong-arm" doctrine or new thinking—there is no other alternative in our time, as the former in no way marries with the latter.

Actions 'Overt Aggression'

LD210430 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Excerpts] [Announcer] As already reported, President Reagan has sent Congress a special message in connection with the incident which occurred last week in the Persian Gulf with the U.S. frigate "Samuel B. Roberts," which was damaged by a mine, and the subsequent strike against Iranian oil platforms conducted by the U.S. Navy on 18 April. [passage omitted] I will ask my colleague, Nikolay Agayants to speak about this in more detail.

[Agayants] The influential U.S. newspaper THE NEW YORK TIMES, reflecting the obvious alarm and concern of the country's citizens about what is now happening in that explosive region, termed the course of the United States in the Persian Gulf zone very, very risky. Events over the last few days have not only fully confirmed the correctness of this simple conclusion, but have also directly testified to the fact that Washington is by no means renouncing the opportunity of stepping over the line and getting involved in an open armed conflict with Iran.

In any case, Sergey Yevgenyevich, the document you mentioned, the message sent by Reagan to Capitol Hill, in accordance with the terms of the War Powers Act, is pursuing a very definite aim. And that is: Under no circumstances to allow the bringing into force of this act, which, let me remind you, demands that U.S. troops should be withdrawn from a region of combat operations within 60 days. In other words, to untie their hands in case of an exacerbation of the conflict.

The policy of pressure by force, the policy of the notorious big stick, so loved by the adherents of neoglobalism from the time of President Theodore Roosevelt, this policy bears a threat to countries of the region and is a dangerous, destabilizing factor in the Middle and Near East.

To call things by their real names, one should admit that U.S. warships in the Gulf carried out an act of overt aggression under the hackneyed pretext of ensuring the security of international shipping in the region. Unfortunately, one has to state that Washington has no intention of giving up attempts to defend its interests by any other means but military, thus pouring oil on the fire of the blazing Iran-Iraq conflict, creating the preconditions for its escalation. [passage omitted]

'Open Disregard' for Community

[Aleksandr Pogodin commentary]
LD211339 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 21 Apr 88

[Text] Judging by official announcements, the White House considers the situation in the Gulf quite normal. A presidential spokesman says the events that took place on Monday proved the efficiency of the forces deployed in the Gulf and confirmed the correctness of the administration's political and military line. In other words, Washington has every intention of using military force, completely disregarding the consequences no matter how far-reaching they may be.

The tension in the Gulf has risen to such a degree that at any time it can set off a chain reaction causing an exchange of military strikes, which will be very difficult to stop. I'd like to point out that the U.S. Administration is trying to present its actions in the Gulf as lawful. (?It speaks about adherence) of the United States to the United Nations Security Council resolution adopted last July aimed at ending the hotbed of tension in the Persian Gulf. It's worth recalling that the resolution requested all countries which do not belong to the region to refrain from any actions which may worsen the tension. However, the real attitude of the United States to the Security Council call is perceived through its acts of retribution against civil targets—oil platforms.

The unaccountable character of the American actions, their open disregard toward the opinions of the world community, cannot but cause indignation on a wide scale. To reduce the condemnation of its actions, the United States has planted in some western mass media a news item that it consulted other countries, including the Soviet Union, about its intention to attack the Iranian oil platform. The Soviet Union has rejected this, saying it only received the information from the United States after the military operation had taken place. The United States' attempt to indirectly shift part of its responsibility on other countries for escalating the tension in the Gulf has been rebuffed.

'Sense of Alarm' in U.S.

PM211323 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Apr 88 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent A. Blinov dispatch: "The Persian Gulf: Reaction to the Clashes"]

[Text] Washington—On Tuesday U.S. President Reagan sent Congress a report regarding the military actions that American naval forces had carried out against Iran the day before.

It presented the operation during which two Iranian oil-refining platforms were sunk and several Iranian ships damaged, as a "self-defense" measure. "Our Armed Forces are ready to undertake additional necessary measures for self-defense and the defense of American-flagged ships," the report says. However, as the American press comments, the possibility of new actions has generated a sense of alarm in a number of American legislators that the "commitments" which the United States itself has assumed in that region of the globe could have unpredicatable consequences. "Fears have arisen in Congress that President Reagan is heading toward war with the Ayatollah Khomeyni," THE WASHINGTON POST comments.

Sam Nunn, influential American legislator and chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, urged that "events not be allowed to develop into an American-Iranian war." "We must reexamine our course," Nunn said.

The confrontations in the Persian Gulf produced a leap in oil prices on world markets, caused by fears of interruptions in oil deliveries. It is reported that work has virtually stopped at many oil-refining installations in the coastal zone of the Persian Gulf since the American-Iranian clashes. Tankers loaded with oil are moored in a number of Gulf ports: It is not safe to put to sea. "Shipping and oil transportation in the southern part of the Persian Gulf are almost paralyzed," THE WASHINGTON POST reports.

The American press cites evidence that the concentration of major U.S. naval forces in the Persian Gulf has not improved the conditions for international shipping in the region, which plays an extremely important role in the supply of oil to many countries. According to data supplied by the Washington Defense Information Center, the tanker war intensified after the United States sharply stepped up its presence in the Persian Gulf last summer.

According to Rear Admiral E. Carroll, retired, deputy director of the Washington Defense Information Center, last Monday's events are leading to a further heightening of tension in the Persian Gulf. He remarked that the United States "has leapt two steps up the conflict-escalation ladder."

Visa Refusal Thwarts Kondrashov's U.S. Visit

PM201215 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Apr 88 Morning Edition p5

["Own Information" article: "The Logic of Shabby Treatment"]

[Text] You cannot always tell from the actions of some people whether they have got out of bed the wrong side or whether the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing. A recent incident gave us the opportunity to satisfy ourselves that this feature is quite universal.

On 19 April a Soviet delegation led by V.M. Falin, chairman of the NOVOSTI board, flew from Moscow to Washington at the invitation of the United States Information Agency (USIA). The point of its visit is to discuss issues concerning the exchange of information between the USSR and the United States. The delegation includes representatives of two CPSU Central Committee departments, the Foreign Ministry, the Ministry of Culture, the USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade, the USSR State Committee for Cinematography, TASS, and the USSR, Ukrainian, and Lithuanian State Committees for Television and Radio Broadcasting, and the chief editors of republic newspapers from Latvia and Estonia.

Several days before the delegation left, USIA director Mr Charles Wick, who is responsible for the idea of the aforementioned discussions, asked PRAVDA and IZVESTIYA representatives to be included in the delegation, especially as he had visited the editorial offices of these two newspapers during his visit to Moscow. Ye.Ye. Grigoryev, deputy chief editor, was chosen to represent PRAVDA in the delegation. The IZVESTIYA editorial office proposed political observer S.N. Kondrashov, who was due to fly to the United States several days later anyway, for the 16th Dartmouth conference of the American and Soviet public; the U.S. Embassy already had his passport for the purpose of issuing a visa. C. Wick thanked us for efficiently dealing with his request. The matter seemed to be decided.

That is the problem: It seemed to be.... Late in the evening the day before the delegation was due to leave, the embassy informed us—in the traditional American manner—that the State Department had refused S.N. Kondrashov a visa. The reason? He is flying to the Dartmouth conference. That is fine. But he cannot go to the discussion on the exchange of information. Excuse us, this was not our suggestion—the director of the USIA requested it. But just try to understand the logic of this shabby treatment: Either the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing in Mr. Wick's department or someone in the State Department got out of bed the wrong side.

If we take a wider view, incidentally, this is the same kind of logic whereby Charles Wick, who invited authoritative Soviet representatives to discuss the exchange of information, organized a sensational campaign on the eve of their visit—on the "Worldnet" radio and television network, for all the world to see and hear—about "Soviet disinformation" concerning the United States.

People have short memories, as they say. The reader knows that S.N. Kondrashov has long been concerned with U.S. topics in his work for IZVESTIYA. He has considerable experience and has visited the United States many times. In his recent material, as in that of other USSR-U.S.-watchers, he has noted positive changes in relations between the two countries, the erosion of the "enemy image" and the well-known dogmas of the "cold war," and the need for broader, more objective coverage of American life and politics. Quite recently he wrote that civilized behavior at last seems to be making its appearance in our relations, welcoming this fact but at the same time asking the question: How long will it last? Surely we should regard the State Department's action, which offends the dignity of our newspaper and its representative, as an answer to this question?

Further Reportage on Trade Council Meeting

Kamentsev, Verity Address ASTEC

PM201227 Moscow TRUD in Russian 14 Apr 88 p 3

[Report by TASS correspondents B. Grishchenko and A. Mizinov: "Remove the Barriers, Build Bridges"]

[Text] Great hopes are pinned on the current meeting in Moscow of participants in the 11th annual meeting of the American-Soviet Trade and Economic Council (ASTEC). The unanimous opinion is that now, thanks to the thaw in the political climate and the resolute steps which the USSR and the United States have taken toward each other, favorable conditions have been created for eliminating the long-standing obstacles to the development of bilateral trade and economic relations. The time for intensive progress in this sphere has indeed come—the volume of bilateral trade has fallen in recent years and in some areas amounts to less than $2 billion.

The representatives of USSR and U.S. business circles are looking for and already achieving concrete results. Mercury, the patron of merchants, brought the first good news early on the morning of 13 April. While V.L. Malkevich, the Soviet cochairman of ASTEC and chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Chamber of Trade and Industry, was congratulating the meeting participants at the capital's International Trade Center on the beginning of the plenary session's work, a few storeys higher in that building the veteran of U.S.-Soviet trade A. Hammer was signing the documents envisaging the creation of new joint enterprises: two new plants for the production of PVC products are going to be built in the Ukraine. Three-fourths of the resins and films produced will be sold in the CEMA countries and the Soviet Union with the remainder sold in the Western market. The chairman of the board of directors of Occidental Petroleum gave an assurance that 25 percent of the output produced will be quite sufficient to enable the firm to cover its depreciation costs and make a profit which, in turn, will enable even further progress to be made in this area.

During the plenary session ASTEC directors will be elected from both the USSR and the United States. The honorary title of Meritorious Director of the Council was unanimously conferred on one man who was there at the beginning of Soviet-U.S. business ties—D. Kendall, chairman of the board of directors of Pepsico. This well-known U.S. businessman was a member of the organizing body which created ASTEC and is now among those who actively promote the consolidation of business contacts between our countries on a mutually beneficial basis.

The present stage of Soviet-U.S. relations offers a unique opportunity for business people from the two countries to promote the development of trade between our countries to the benefit of themselves and others, V.M. Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers foreign economic commission, told the assembly. The visit to Washington by M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, and his talks with the U.S. President opened new horizons and created the conditions for the steady development of Soviet-U.S. relations, the speaker said. It is symbolic that during the summit talks there was an objective discussion not only of the key problems of security but also of questions of the state of and prosepcts for the development of Soviet-U.S. trade and economic ties.

The increased attention paid to the economic component of Soviet-U.S. relations is understandable. Since the all-embracing system of international security presupposes the establishment of a just international economic order, the elimination of discrimination and the overall improvement of trade and economic relations between the Soviet Union and the United States meets the fundamental interests of our countries' peoples and all mankind.

A great contribution to the solution of this task is made by ASTEC, which for 15 years now (some of which were politically very difficult years) has been looking for ways to normalize trade and economic relations between the USSR and the United States.

Business cooperation between the two countries goes back many years. But in recent years commodity exchange between them has been falling steadily. Its structure is one-sided.

In the modern world, the speaker noted, we simply cannot and have no right to disregard factors which stabilize relations, factors such as trade and economic, scientific, and technical ties. If we really want firm stable relations capable of enduring a secure peace they must be founded on well-developed business ties.

The further development of trade and economic exchange and the improvement of the exchange balance can only be achieved if the U.S. side is really ready to broaden equitable and mutually beneficial ties. This presupposes the elimination of all obstacles and impediments to exports to the Soviet Union and Soviet deliveries to the United States. If all the obstacles and impediments are removed broad prospects open up before the partners.

It was subsequently noted that the development of new forms of cooperation contain great potential. Around 40 joint enterprises have already been created and within their framework Soviet organizations are cooperating productively with firms from many countries. Around 200 more projects of this kind are in preparation. The new forms of business ties must be developed on a broader scale with firms in the United States.

Within the ASTEC framework a new concept has been formulated for the development of trade and economic cooperation between the USSR and the United States. It is designed to substantially increase annual commodity turnover between the two countries. It was also noted that under present-day conditions new impetus should be given to scientific and technical cooperation with the aim of pooling the efforts of Soviet and U.S. scientists in the implementation of a number of major projects of which only the USSR and the United States are capable because they possess the largest scientific and technical potential in the world.

The corresponding political will is necessary for the solution of all these problems. Economic relations must be built on a long-term foundation and a basis of equitability, trust, and the strict observance of reciprocal accords.

ASTEC is an authoritaive joint forum and is designed to actively promote the development of business ties between the two countries. After wishing the participants in the meeting fruitful work, V.M. Kamentsev expressed the hope that it will make a substantial concrete contribution to the development of trade and economic relations and the general improvement of the atmosphere between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Business partnership is an important component of relations between our countries, W. Verity, U.S. commerce secretary and head of the U.S. delegation, said. On behalf of the U.S. President he conveyed wishes for successful work to the 11th annual meeting of ASTEC members.

The commerce secretary urged Soviet organizations to attentively study the proposals brought to Moscow by the U.S. business envoys. Trade cooperation between the United States and the USSR has good prospects, he said. However, steady persistent work is needed to realize those prospects. He stressed the U.S. Administration's readiness to promote the development of trade and economic exchanges with our country.

The fruitful discussion is continuing at the International Trade Center. In the afternoon a protocol of intent was signed which reflected the sides' aspiration to develop the partnership between the recently created U.S. trade consortium and its counterpart in our country.

ASTEC President Interviewed

PM200807 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Apr 88 Second Edition p 5

[Interview with American-Soviet Trade and Economic Council President James Giffen by own correspondent V. Linnik: "James Giffen: 'Some Work Is Needed'"]

[Text] New York, 9 Apr—[Linnik] I imagine a situation where there were obstacles on both sides, although of different kinds, to the development of trade and economic relations between our countries. What is your comment on that?

[Giffen] In principle, to achieve a radical improvement of trade and economic relations, it is necessary to solve a number of serious problems of a more general nature. In the first place, our bilateral political relations should be improved (by means of an accord on the reduction of strategic armaments and SDI). Second, it is necessary to achieve progress in the matter of stabilizing the general geopolitical situation in the world by settling regional conflicts in Central America, Afghanistan (which, evidently, is already taking place), Cambodia, and the Near East.

Third, it is necessary to overcome bureaucratic resistance in your country and here. It is present here both in the government and in the corporations. The bureaucracy does not want to change anything simply because it is more convenient and more comfortable that way. It has no strict sense of responsibility—no responsibility to its own leaders, to its own people, their prosperity, and their future, and to mankind. Fourth, it is necessary to achieve a minimum of respectable mutual understanding on human rights issues.

Experience has shown that there is little prospect of a breakthrough in trade and economic relations between our countries without a solution of these problems.

[Linnik] What has prompted the obvious resurgence of interest among U.S. business circles in the development of trade and economic relations with us? The restructuring in our country, potential markets in the Soviet Union for U.S. companies, the softening of the Reagan administration's overall policy vis-a-vis the Soviet Union, or the collapse of the New York Stock Exchange last October?

[Giffen] I will answer very briefly. Yes to the first two points, no to the rest. There has been a massive positive response to restructuring among U.S. business circles. But there are also people here who say that nothing special is happening in the USSR. My invariable answer to that is: You cannot even imagine how major the restructuring is. It is a veritable revolution, I tell the skeptics. The Russians are slow to get the harness on, but they ride fast.

[Linnik] If I asked you to draw up a list of complaints and proposals for our consideration on questions of trade and economic cooperation with the United States, what would you include?

[Giffen] Well, the first point would be the labyrinthine bureaucracy which separates functions into small parts and necessitates endless consultation and coordination, which results in the conscious erosion of personal responsibility. Why should a working conference be attended by 20 people when one is going to decide? He is the one who should be present.

The problem of the competence of the bureaucracy. If you are embarking on a project such as a joint enterprise, then be kind enough to prepare properly for it. At the moment many very important aspects are not being thought through.

If you seriously intend to develop cooperation with the West, then train cadres accordingly: Study the market and management methods, and the elementary matter of balancing the books. This may be in the realm of long-term tasks, but they have to be tackled!

As for the short-term tasks, the tasks at hand: The time it takes at the moment to conclude deals—up to 18 months and more—is unconscionable. After all, time is money, and Western businessmen cannot waste time ad infinitum.. One must learn to **answer** [boldface as published] letters, telexes, telegrams, and telephone calls. They are all part of business practice, without which you will achieve nothing in business.

[Linnik] And if one had a similar list of complaints against the Americans?

[Giffen] The bureaucracy I have already mentioned. I would also mention a total lack of knowledge—in particular about the potential of the Soviet economy and Soviet markets. What is needed is a literacy campaign among U.S. businessmen on these matters.

Then it is necessary to create a mechanism to link the market and centralized economies—a mechanism that would solve all questions of joint economic activity, including financing.

There is also the problem—and it is a common one—of different concepts, where the two sides have entirely different ideas about one and the same thing. Here is a theoretical example purely to illustrate this. Let us say we agree to build a large house. Everyone is agreed, but only later does it come out that one side has in mind building a house with two rooms and the other with thirty rooms. There are plenty of examples of this kind.

[Linnik] Are there grounds for thinking that the ASTEC session in Moscow will provide a breakthrough in the development of Soviet-American trade and economic relations?

[Giffen] There is every reason to believe that. We intend to announce some very remarkable forms and scales of cooperation. Given the right conditions, we could very quickly raise the volume of our trade from the present $1.5 billion to $10-20 billion annually. Some work will be needed to achieve this, of course.

Meeting Results Surveyed

PM201303 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Apr 88 Second Edition p 5

[Report by N. Larionova and S. Tikhomirov: "May the Tree Bear Fruit"]

[Text] One more tree appeared on the lawn in front of Moscow's "Sovintsentr" building on Thursday. It was planted by U.S. Secretary of Commerce W. Verity...

"We have reached specific agreements which will help develop Soviet-American trade relations," Mr Verity said on the American-Soviet Trade and Economic Council's [ASTEC] last working day. "We came to your country not just to take part in talks but also to see with our own eyes what restructuring means and what specific contribution it can make to expanding ties in the sphere of trade between our countries."

The 11th Annual ASTEC Meeting, which ended in Moscow 14 April, was devoted to the search for ways of settling outstanding problems and analyzing potential opportunities for cooperation between our countries' business people, and thus strengthening trust. It clearly demonstrated that the tasks of promoting the development of mutually beneficial trade and economic relations and scientific and technical cooperation among U.S. and Soviet organizations and companies can and must be resolved with goodwill on both sides.

The formation of an American trade consortium and its Soviet partner—a foreign economic consortium—marks an important event in our relations. A protocol of intent on setting up joint enterprises has been signed. Seven of America's largest companies will be participating in the consortium. These include Chevron, Eastman Kodak, Johnson and Johnson, and Mercator. This form of cooperation is quite new for our country. But the very fact of the organization of a consortium specially to set up joint enterprises in the USSR speaks volumes.

"The new climate of cooperation," ASTEC President J. Giffen said, "has created conditions whereby both sides have an interest in expanding trade and economic ties."

Agreements to set up joint enterprises between Occidental Petroleum and the USSR Ministry of the Chemical Industry and between Honeywell and the USSR Ministry of Mineral Fertilizer Production are the fine result of this climate.

Honeywell President Michael Bonsignore in an interview given to your PRAVDA correspondents said: "Of course, there were quite a few difficulties en route to today's signing of the agreement, but we, Americans and Russians, appreciated the main issue—we can work together. I consider the chances of success to be very high. I would particularly point out that the Russian leadership's policy is rated very positively by representatives of American business circles. I hope it will help break down the barriers between us and help us get to know one another better."

Businessmen love repeating that "Time is money." It is particularly noteworthy that representatives of such well-known American companies as Coca Cola, Monsanto, American Express, and others should have wished to share their experience of advertising and marketing with their Soviet colleagues at a special seminar.

...Time will be necessary before the sapling timidly displaying its slender branches to the spring sun on the "Sovintsentr" lawn grows strong and spreads out its thick verdant crown. We would like to believe that the tree of Soviet-American cooperation, capable of bearing fruit commensurate with the two powers' trade and economic potential, will also henceforth grow stronger and develop.

China

National Peoples' Congress Session Ends

PM210925 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Apr 88 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent Yu. Savenkov article under the rubric "Facts, Events, Opinions": "Greater Openness: PRC National People's Congress Session Finishes Work"]

[Text] Beijing—The first session of the PRC National People's Congress (NPC), Seventh Convocation, came to a close on Wednesday in Beijing's House of People's Assemblies on the country's main square—Tiananmen—to the sounds of the national anthem.

The work of the supreme organ of state power, which has been discussing the vital problems of life in Chinese society, has been the focus of attention of this country with a population of 1 billion. The closing plenary session was attended by Zhao Ziyang, Deng Xiaoping, Li Peng, Li Xiannian, Peng Zhen, Deng Yingchao, and other leaders. PRC President Yang Shangkun (the fourth president in the history of the PRC after Mao Zedong, Liu Shaoqi, and Li Xiannian) talked in his first speech delivered in his new capacity about the enormous responsibility which lies on his shoulders in the fulfillment of his lofty duty. He promised deputies that he would use the authority invested in him by the Constitution correctly. On behalf of all deputies Yang Shangkun expressed appreciation to Li Xiannian, his predecessor in the post of president of the PRC, for his tireless and fruitful work.

Wan Li, newly elected chairman of the NPC Standing Committee, talked of the need for greater openness in the activity of the NPC and its Standing Committee and stronger ties between deputies and the electorate. Our fundamental task is to develop socialist democracy and improve socialist legality, Wan Li said.

The resolution adopted by the session on Li Peng's report on government work says that the report is distinguished by its realistic approach, shows the achievements of the government supported by the people, and also notes problems, difficulties, shortcomings, and errors. The session demanded that the PRC State Council and government bodies at all levels firmly implement the CPC's basic policy "at the initial stage of socialism" in the next 5 years and accelerate and deepen the reform and the policy of expanding ties with the outside world. During the session's work more than 100 changes were made to the text of the government report. Following deputies' proposals, more detail was added, in particular to the sections of the report concerning agriculture, transport and communications, education, and regional autonomy in areas with national minorities.

The session adopted a total of 11 resolutions on the last day, which included approving the plan for economic and social development in 1988, the report on fulfillment of the 1987 state budget, and the draft budget for 1988.

Growth, Benefits of Border Trade Highlighted

OW190614 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to Asia-Pacific Region 1300 GMT 15 Apr 88

[Excerpts] In a world which requires mutual contact and cooperation, various countries, especially neighboring countries, must develop extensive trade and economic cooperation. Otherwise, it will be an inconceivable thing. The Soviet Union clearly understands this point. The border trade between the Soviet Union's Far East region and China's northeast region occupies a special position in our country's foreign trade. [passage omitted]

Both sides can benefit from the border trade and this is the foundation for developing it. Border trade can increase the varieties of commodities, promote and consolidate relations between the Soviet Union and

China, and create favorable conditions for maintaining good-neighborly relations between the people of the two countries and achieving mutual understanding.

Border trade between the two countries has a history of 30 years. After a period of interruption, it was resumed through the exchange of documents between the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Trade and the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations and Trade on 16 April 1982. Both sides pointed out in the document that such trade should be conducted in the spirit of equality and mutual benefit. In the past several years, both sides have strictly adhered to and observed this principle. [passage omitted]

Through border trade, the Soviet Union exported chemical fertilizer, caustic soda, glass, cement, lumber materials, sedans, household electric appliances, motorcycles, and other daily necessities to the Chinese side, while China exported frozen meat, canned meat, soybeans, vegetables, fruit, light industry products, and textile products to the Soviet side.

The volume of border trade between the two countries was not very large at first but a significant increase was registered in 1986. The total value of border trade reached R28 million, increasing by 300 percent over 1982. [passage omitted] In 1987, the total value of the border trade was more than double that in the previous year and reached R65.4 million. However, both sides are convinced that there is great potential in developing border trade between the two countries. [passage omitted]

Both the Soviet Union and China hope to expand border trade and strengthen economic contacts. The Heilongjiang Provincial People's Government plans to open five additional border trade stations this year and this proves their viewpoint. Their interest is not coincidental because such contacts can greatly promote the economic development of border regions of both countries and raise the living standard of the people in border regions.

Near East & South Asia

Pakistani Authorities Blamed for Blast

PM211051 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Apr 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Reason for Explosion—Sabotage?"]

[Text] Delhi, 13 Apr—New information is coming to light on the scale of the tragedy which has befallen the inhabitants of Islamabad and the adjacent city of Rawalpindi as a result of the 10 April explosion of an ammunition dump close to the Pakistani capital. According to official reports, at present those killed and those who died from wounds number 98. Several people are still in critical condition. The total number of wounded exceeded 1,100 people. According to Pakistani newspaper reports, the authorities still do not have information on the whereabouts of over 3,000 people. Sappers have already discovered and rendered harmless about 20,000 unexploded devices, mines and rockets, scattered by the blast wave over a radius of about 10 km. Centers for donating blood and for collecting funds to assist victims are working in many cities in Pakistan at the initiative of political parties and public organizations.

In Islamabad a special session of the cabinet of ministers took place chaired by Pakistani Prime Minister M.K. Junejo, which examined the question of progress in eliminating the consequences of the explosion. A committee was created to which the report of the commission leading the investigation into the reasons for the incident will be presented in 10 days.

Pakistan's official circles are expressing the opinion that sabotage could have been the reason for the explosion, REUTER says. Rana Naim Mahmud Khan, Pakistan's state defense minister, stated that if this is so, then this is obviously connected with attempts to put pressure on Pakistan on the eve of signing the Geneva accords. As is known, the leaders of the Afghan opposition based on Pakistani territory have stated that they do not recognize the accords reached in Geneva at the proximity Afghan-Pakistani talks on settling the situation in Afghanistan.

In an editorial article, the Indian newspaper THE HINDU places the responsibility for what happened on the Pakistani authorities. The Indian people express profound sympathy to the victims of the catastrophe in the neighboring country. But, the newspaper writes, it is difficult to dismiss the political significance of everything that has happened. The military authorities, with scandalous disregard for safety norms, placed a major ammunition dump in the capital's suburb and has utilized it as the base for supplying weapons to the Afghan opposition groupings. In other words, the inhabitants of Islamabad and adjacent cities have in essence been turned into the hostages of secret military operations.

Afghanistan's Amin Addresses Kabul Conference

LD202027 Moscow TASS in English 1759 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] Kabul April 20 TASS—The conference of Afghan, American and Soviet public on Afghanistan-related issues was continuing in session in the Afghan capital today. Sayyed 'Amanuddin Amin, first vice president of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Afghanistan, delivered a report at the conference on the subject "Economic Aspects of Afghanistan's Development".

Despite the fact that under the present-day difficult conditions we are forced to spend a considerable part of our resources on defense and security needs, he said, the Afghan Government is pursuing a realistic policy in the field of the economy. He pointed out the great significance of economic cooperation with the socialist countries, especially with the Soviet Union, and stressed that at the same time Afghanistan is preparing for broadening economic ties with all states.

We hope, S.'A. Amin said, that in pursuing a humane policy the developed countries, international organizations and private entrepreneurs will not deny assistance to our long suffering people.

Analyst Discusses Afghan Reconciliation

LD201830 Moscow TASS in English 1613 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 20 TASS—TASS news analyst Valeriy Vavilov writes:

A "week of solidarity with the Republic of Afghanistan" which is being observed by a decision of the World Peace Council has become particularly topical these days: the Afghan-Pakistani talks on a settlement of the Afghanistan situation have been successfully completed in Geneva following a six-years-long marathon. Peace-loving people around the world welcome the event the significance of which is difficult to overestimate.

Its importance is not limited to Afghanistan alone to which the Geneva agreements open up the way towards an end to the fratricidal bloodshed and towards the establishment of peace and tranquility on its soil, and create conditions for the return of millions of Afghans home from foreign lands.

The success of the Geneva talks was, undoubtedly, also promoted by solidarity shown by the international movement of millions of people of goodwill who came out in support of the Afghan people and their striving for the building of a peaceful future without interference from the outside, without American 'Stinger' missiles and British 'Blowpipe' ones, a future without the enormous stockpiles of arms, hardware, and ammunition which have been lavishly supplied for many years from the military arsenals of Western and some other countries.

The Geneva agreements have now furnished all the necessary legal foundations for an end to interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan, which has also created conditions for a withdrawal of Soviet troops.

It is very important that the Geneva agreements be observed by all states connected with the complex regional conflict and that they all join the guarantees and obligations assumed by the Soviet Union and the United States.

All this is the subject of discussion at a conference, which has opened in Kabul, of representatives of the Afghan, American, and Soviet public on matters concerning Afghanistan. The participants in the conference are discussing prospects for national reconciliation and for the creation of a neutral, independent and non-aligned Afghanistan.

It would be naive, of course, to suppose that guns would stop firing on the battlefields in Afghanistan at the moment when the negotiators put their signatures to agreements that were on the table of the Geneva talks. The fratricidal war is far from being ended. It is going on, still claiming a toll of human lives.

The 'Peshawar Seven' do not even think of downing arms while their leader Hikmatyar has stated that 'the signing of the agreements does not mean either an end to the war or return of refugees', and called for a continuation of the war.

Unfortunately, the insurgents' bellicose statements are based on the pronouncements and promises of some Pakistani and American figures who voiced their readiness to continue to help the rebels in their fight against the Kabul government, although, it would seem, it is perfectly clear that only irresponsible figures can ignore, turn down or violate the norms and principles of a settlement.

It is not ruled out that the Afghan insurgents, who are being incited by their most extremist leaders, will try to launch carnage and terror against the present Kabul authorities. This does not promise anything good to the Afghan people.

But at the same time another, reassuring prospect is coming into view: the Afghan people giving greater scope to their policy of national reconciliation, will take their destiny into their own hands, will form a coalition government on the broadest basis, including opposition forces, which would suit all sections of population, and will create conditions for the return of refugees, and will not allow anyone to prevent them from building a peaceful future.

In this striving for a peaceful future the Afghan people will need the solidarity and support of all people of goodwill.

Murakhovskiy Meets Afghan Commerce Minister

PM201523 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Apr 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Conversation Held"]

[Text] On 19 April, V.S. Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Gosagroprom, received M.K. Jalalar, Afghan commerce minister.

Some questions pertaining to Soviet-Afghan economic cooperation were discussed during the conversation.

Soviet Ship Discovers Minefield in Gulf

PM201451 [Editorial Report] Captain 3rd Rank A. Golodov, whose ship, the minesweeper "Kurskiy Komsomolets", accompanied Soviet ships in the Persian Gulf "for more than 2 months," is profiled in a 2200-word article by Captain 3d Rank V. Pasyakin in the Second Edition of Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA on 19 April. The ship traveled "some 13,900 miles" during this time period. The author does not give specific dates, but he notes that "the tanker 'Marshal Chuykov' hit a mine on the very day that the 'Kurskiy Komsomolets' joined the detachment of Soviet warships in the Indian Ocean" and records that "later, when newspapers were carrying photographs of the U.S. frigate 'Stark' hit by missiles and when a Pakistani tanker had been strafed literally before the seamen's very eyes, their feelings had gotten somewhat 'accustomed'."

The author chronicles a certain day when the minesweeper encountered a minefield. The first "mine-like object" was detected at 0430, and the "last contact of Petty Officer First Class V. Dydov's watch—the 15th—was recorded at 0620." After this, "another four mine-like objects" were detected before the captain "concluded that the minefield had been passed." The author notes that when the ship was passing through the minefield, the captain "marked the coordinates" of one of the detected mines on a chart.

'Hitlerite Butcher' Demjanjuk Found Guilty

PM201527 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Apr 88 Second Edition p 5

[PRAVDA-TASS report: "Israel"]

[Text] REUTER's correspondent reports from Jerusalem that the Israeli court has found John (Ivan) Demjanjuk guilty of crimes committed during World War II. The court was presented with irrefutable evidence that Demjanjuk did indeed operate a gas chamber at Treblinka, the fascist concentration camp, and participated directly in the mass extermination of prisoners. This Hitlerite butcher, who has escaped justice for over 40 years, now faces the death penalty. The court will announce its final verdict next Monday.

Sub-Saharan Africa

SWAPO's Nujoma Continues Talks in Moscow

Meets Gromyko, Dobrynin

LD201912 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1725 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow, 20 Apr (TASS)—A.A. Gromyko and A.F.Dobrynin today met in the Kremlin with a delegation from SWAPO, the South-West African People's Organization, headed by SWAPO President Sam Nujoma.

In the delegation are Theo-Ben Gurirab, Hidipo Hamutenja, and Peter Mueshihange, members of the Politburo and secretaries of the SWAPO Central Committee; Phillemon Malima, head of the SWAPO mission in Moscow and member of the Politburo of the SWAPO Central Committee; and Pashukene Shoombe [name as received], SWAPO representative in the Pan-African Women's Organization.

Namibia is the last colony on the African Continent. The racist RSA, which occupies the country despite the clearly expressed will of its people, numerous UN decisions, and the demands of the world public, tramples on the basic principles and statutes of international law and the norms of morality. The South African apartheid regime uses "death squads" to mass murder the population of Namibia. These act in the spirit of the Nazi Sonderkommando of World War II.

Talking about the tragic fate of Namibia, S. Nujoma stressed that the Namibian people will never reconcile itself to foreign domination. It is quite determined to drive the colonizers from its soil. The liberation struggle headed by SWAPO is developing in the most varied of forms—political, armed, and diplomatic. The front of the freedom fighters is becoming broader and stronger.

On the Soviet side, there was a statement of total support for the just cause of the Namibian patriots. A.A. Gromyko warmly congratulated the SWAPO president on the 28th anniversary of the founding of the party, which fell on 19 April. He expressed solidarity with SWAPO, which has earned recognition as the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people through its selfless struggle for an independent, democratic, and united Namibia.

During the conversation, the belief was expressed that the Namibian problem can be solved by political methods, by holding general elections in this country under the observation and control of the UN, as stipulated in UN Security Council Resolution No 435 (1978). A positive appraisal was given to the new constructive Angolan and Cuban initiatives, aimed at the urgent settlement of the conflict in southwestern Africa on the basis of ensuring Angolan independence and security.

At the same time, the meeting's participants noted that the positive development that has emerged on questions of settlement are being blocked by the RSA regime, which fears free elections in Namibia, has set itself the goal of placing its own puppets in power there, and continues to use Namibian territory as a base for blatant interference and overt aggression against people's Angola.

As for Western powers, the United States first and foremost, their policy only encourages the racists to commit even more impudent and destructive actions. The sides condemned the position of Western circles that openly supports the racist regime in the RSA and which, on invented pretexts, places obstacles in the way of the imposition of effective international sanctions against Pretoria. Those taking part in the talks called on all for whom the ideals of liberty and independence are dear to get involved in the world movement that embraces the broad international public and has the aim of eliminating the last seats of colonialism and racism in southern Africa.

The representatives of the USSR and SWAPO resolutely demanded the release of all Namibian and South African political prisoners, and the annulment of the death sentences on the "Sharpeville Six."

The president of SWAPO expressed heartfelt gratitude to the CPSU and the entire Soviet people for their firm and consistent support for the freedom fighters of Namibia. He declared that Namibian patriots welcome the efforts of the Soviet Union aimed at creating an all-embracing system of international security. SWAPO is willing to make its contribution to those efforts that are now being undertaken in the interests of a political solution to the problems in southern Africa. Nujoma stressed that SWAPO is not against whites as such, but against the colonial system, and that after the people's victory in the national liberation struggle, independent Namibia will be a home for all Namibians, black and white.

A.A. Gromyko and A.F. Dobrynin asked S. Nujoma to convey best wishes for success to the South-West African Peoples' Organization, SWAPO, and to the people of Namibia from M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. It was stated that, although we are far apart in territorial terms, our peoples hold out hands of friendship to each other.

At the meeting, the mutual desire for further strengthening the friendly ties between the CPSU and SWAPO was expressed.

The conversation was held in a warm and comradely atmosphere.

Received by Kapitsa

LD202127 Moscow TASS in English 2032 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 20 TASS—A delegation of South-west Africa People's Organization (SWAPO, Namibia) led by the organisation's president Sam Nujoma met today at the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee with the committee's chairman, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences Mikhail Kapitsa.

The president of SWAPO spoke about the struggle that Namibian patriots wage under the guidance of their sole authentic representative, SWAPO, against the occupation regime of South Africa, for Namibia's freedom and independence. He spoke about the growing political mobilization of the masses, the stepped up armed resistance to the South African colonialists. Sam Nujoma expressed gratitude to the Soviet public for moral and political support and material assistance.

The leaders of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee and the Soviet Peace Foundation confirm the invariable sympathies of the Soviet people for the liberation struggle of the Namibian people and expressed the readiness to support SWAPO efforts aimed at an early achievement of independence on the basis of the known decisions of the United Nations. They expressed the [word indistinct] to give support to SWAPO activity in this direction on a bilateral and multilateral level.

Eritrea, Tigre Fighting 'Sharply Exacerbated'

PM201145 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Apr 88 Second Edition p 3

[Captain 2d Rank V. Kocherov article under the "International Notes" rubric: "Eritrea and Tigre Once Again"]

[Text] The situation in the north of Ethiopia has long been the focus of the country's domestic policy problems. This is the place where what is for our times an absurd struggle, but also, in terms of the drama of its events, an exceptional struggle against starvation, has been intensely waged for several years now. I visited the north of Ethiopia 3 years ago at the height of the nationwide disaster in connection with the latest drought. I remember to this day the eyes of people emaciated from starvation. Something else also stuck in my mind: the guards and sandbags at the entrance to state establishments and the patrols on the streets of Asmera—Eritrea's main city—and the numerous armed posts on the northern roads.

The situation here has been sharply exacerbated recently. According to AP, separatists from the so-called Eritrean People's Liberation Front [EPLF] recently seized the city of Afabet in Eritrea Province and killed or captured several thousand soldiers from the Revolutionary Armed Forces. REUTER has reported that several population centers had been captured in Tigre Province, including Aksum—the ancient capital of Ethiopia—as a result of heavy fighting with Tigre People's Liberation Front [TPLF] rebel forces.

It has been noted that the activation of the counterrevolutionary forces' sorties, encouraged and orchestrated by certain Western organizations, comes at a time when the country is experiencing difficulties. The latest hardships linked with the new drought befell Ethiopia in the second half of last year. Since then separatist actions have also been stepped up. What do they want? The EPLF has long been waging a struggle for Eritrea to secede from the state. The TPLF, headed by former big feudal lords, is fighting to restore feudalism in the country. The terrorist actions which are being perpetrated by separatist gangs in the north of Ethiopia, Mengistu Haile-Mariam, general secretary of the Workers Party of Ethiopia [WPE] Central Committee and Ethiopian president, stated, are designed to split the country. They are placing its unity and freedom in grave jeopardy. We see no other recourse than to resolutely repulse the forces which are continuing to proceed along the path of undermining national unity, the Ethiopian leader stressed.

Ethiopia is implementing national mobilization. UPI reported that last week government troops began a broad counteroffensive in Eritrea and Tigre Provinces. The scale of this offensive is illustrated by the fact that a large proportion of the aircraft belonging to the national Ethiopian airline are being used to transfer subunits to the north of the country where, presumably, the armed struggle will assume even greater dimensions in the immediate future. According to a statement by an EPLF spokesman from Khartoum, active contacts are being organized between various Eritrean groupings in order to amalgamate them into a united front and plans are being elaborated to seize Asmera and Ethiopia's main ports—Mitsiwa and Aseb. But it is through these ports that basic food supplies are reaching Ethiopia today from many countries of the world, including the United States.

The present exacerbation of hostilities has already seriously restricted the operations to provide the northern part of the country with food. A number of roads here are either of restricted access or are mined. Except for the airfields at Asmera and Mekele—the main city in Tigre Province—all others are closed to civil aviation, including to aircraft carrying food supplies. The separatists are destroying motor convoys carrying food, attacking the local headquarters of various relief organizations, and imprisoning their personnel. The policy of terror and aggression being practised by the antipopular groupings conflicts with their leaders' statements that they are ready to begin peace talks with the Ethiopian leadership. On the contrary, it is the leadership which has been holding out its hand for a long time to those who want to resolve the country's internal problems by peaceful means. The doors remain open to all those who are prepared to take part in implementing constructive ideas, Mengistu Haile-Mariam stressed in his speech at the recent WPE Central Committee Plenum. The Ethiopian leader once again mentioned the resolution of the Ethiopian National Assembly inaugural session held last September which carries a call for peace and specific proposals for settling the national problems in the north of Ethiopia. The fact that the Ethiopian leadership resumed diplomatic relations with Somalia last week also illustrates that the government is endeavoring in deeds and not just in words to resolve internal and external problems exclusively at the negotiating table.

History has often proved that armed struggle against the people's power with a view to resolving internal problems is a hopeless cause. There is no doubt that Ethiopia's Armed Forces will resolutely rebuff those who are trying today to turn the country away from the path of democratic transformations.

Mauritian Labor Party Group Visits USSR

PM201205 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Apr 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "At the Invitation of the CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] A delegation from the Mauritian Labor Party headed by R. Purryag, member of the Mauritian Labor Party Central Committee Politburo, was in our country on a familiarization visit from 28 March through 10 April at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee.

The delegation was received at the CPSU Central Committee International Department, the AUCCTU, the Soviet Committee for Solidarity with Asian and African Countries, the Soviet Committee For the Defense of Peace, and the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries, and met with Soviet scientists and social scientists. The Mauritian Labor Party members took a trip to Kiev, where they had conversations at the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee and the republic's Supreme Soviet and visited industrial and agricultural enterprises and educational establishments.

The visitors from Mauritius pointed out that when they had familiarized themselves with Soviet reality, they saw the groundlessness of the propaganda which tries to present restructuring as the "dismantling of socialism" and were able to see the slogan "More Socialism, More Democracy" being implemented in practice. The Mauritian Labor Party representatives expressed their support for the new political thinking in international affairs and for the development of Soviet-Mauritian cooperation.

East Europe

Ryzhkov Continues Official Visit to Hungary

Talks With Kadar, Nemeth

PM211001 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Apr 88 Second Edition pp 1,4

[TASS report: "Meetings in Budapest"]

[Text] Budapest, 20 Apr—J. Kadar, MSZMP general secretary, today received in Budapest N.I. Ryzhkov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR Council of Ministers chairman, who is in Hungary on an official friendly visit.

At the meeting, which proceeded in a cordial, comradely atmosphere, J. Kadar and N.I. Ryzhkov informed each other on preparations for the 19th all-union party conference and the Hungarian national party conference. They noted with satisfaction that the CPSU and the MSZMP are united in their assessment of the main issues concerning socialist building. Relying on the results of socialist building and on joint and international experience, the CPSU and the MSZMP are progressing along the path of restructuring and social renewal. The contemporary development of the two countries requires more effective use of socialism's potential. This is in the interests of the Soviet and Hungarian peoples, the socialist community, and world progress.

The sides emphasized that regular meetings between the CPSU and the MSZMP leaders successfully contribute to the solution of topical political and economic tasks. They clearly reflect the efforts of both parties to strengthen Soviet-Hungarian ties, develop mutually advantageous, balanced cooperation, and consistently and persistently seek modern solutions and forms of collaboration on the basis of real potential.

K. Grosz, MSZMP Central Committee Politburo member and Hungarian Council of Ministers chairman, S. Rajnai, Hungarian ambassador to the Soviet Union, and B.I. Stukalin, Soviet ambassador to Hungary, took part in the meeting.

On the same day N.I. Ryzhkov had a meeting in the parliament building with K. Nemeth, member of the MSZMP Central Committee Politburo and president of the Hungarian Presidential Council.

During the conversation the main attention was devoted to the questions of further developing Soviet-Hungarian cooperation along state and social lines in the new conditions, in which both countries are undergoing important processes of renewal and stabilization and a greater role is being played by elected organs of power in matters concerning the internal development of each country and in international affairs. The USSR Council of Ministers chairman noted that the democratization of all areas of social activity is having a positive impact on the broadening of contacts and collaboration between the two countries, their legislative organs, and also their enterprises, organizations, and labor collectives—which is shown, in particular, by the positive experience of direct ties between them.

K. Nemeth said that the practical implementation of the accords reached during A.A. Gromyko's recent visit to Hungary is a good basis for expanding and improving cooperation between the Hungarian National Assembly and the USSR Supreme Soviet. He also provided information on the activity of Hungarian legislators to implement the program of socioeconomic stabilization.

The participants in the meeting noted the increasing responsibility of all countries' parliaments for the preservation of world peace and the development of cooperation between states with different sociopolitical systems.

Meets Economic Leaders

PM211039 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Apr 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Community of Aims"]

[Excerpts] Budapest, 20 Apr—[Passage omitted] N.I. Ryzhkov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR Council of Ministers chairman, had a meeting today in the Hungarian Chamber of Commerce with economic leaders and scientific and technical figures.

In his speech the head of the Soviet Government gave detailed explanations of a broad range of issues connected with the implementation of radical economic reform in the Soviet Union, the restructuring of its foreign economic ties, and the improvement of the mechanism of cooperation between the USSR and Hungary and within the CEMA framework as a whole. [passage omitted]

The meeting was attended by K. Grosz, MSZMP Central Committee Politburo member and Hungarian Council of Ministers chairman; J. Marjai, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and Hungarian trade minister; A.K. Antonov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; and other persons accompanying the head of the Soviet Government.

Documents Signed

LD201934 Moscow TASS in English 1903 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] Budapest April 20 TASS—The Hungarian Economic Chamber, grouping on a voluntary basis the country's enterprises and representing their interests in state bodies and public organisations, today hosted a meeting between Nikolay Ryzhkov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and economic managers, scientists and technologists.

The head of the Soviet Government dwelt on a broad range of issues connected with the Soviet Union's radical economic reform and restructuring of its foreign economic ties and the perfection of the mechanism of cooperation between the USSR and Hungary within the framework of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance on the whole.

Soviet-Hungarian documents were signed in the parliamentary building. The two governments signed an agreement on promoting consumer goods exchanges carried out between enterprises and organisations of domestic trade and consumer cooperatives, and an additional protocol to the agreement between the two countries on terms for mutual travel of citizens without visas on November 24, 1987.

Holds News Conference

PM211319 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Apr 88 Second Edition pp 4,5

[TASS report under the general heading "Community of Aims"]

[Text] Budapest, 20 Apr—N.I. Ryzhkov's official friendly visit to the Hungarian People's Republic has ended. A news conference was held here today for Hungarian and foreign journalists.

N.I. Ryzhkov said in his speech: The time has, clearly, come to sum up a few results of our stay in the Hungarian People's Republic. I shall say upfront that we are satisfied with what we have managed to do during these days.

I should like to take the opportunity to express once again profound gratitude to the leadership of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, to the Hungarian Government and to everyone whom we met on Hungarian soil for their fraternal and cordial welcome.

We express thanks for the great attention displayed by J. Kadar, MSZMP general secretary. Fundamental questions of Soviet-Hungarian relations were touched on in the conversation with him, and there was an exchange of information about the broad preparations that are under way in our countries for the forthcoming party conferences, dealing with key issues in international affairs. The meeting with K. Nemeth, chairman of the Hungarian People's Republic Presidium, was useful and substantive. The talks with K. Grosz, Hungarian Council of Ministers chairman, were very thorough and important.

We found it extremely interesting to tour the Tungsram electrical engineering enterprise and the instrument-building cooperative in Budapest, and the New Life agro-industrial cooperative in Komarom County. As for the main impression, we were able everywhere to sense the labor collectives' deep interest in the high results of their enterprises' activities. Their initiative, creative search, intense labor rhythm and responsibility stem from this. One must give our Hungarian friends their due—they have managed to assign to the human factor a decisive role in raising the efficiency of public-sector production and to arouse people's creative initiative. There is much to be learned here.

The talks with the Hungarian leaders have enabled us to discuss comprehensively the topical problems of socialist construction in the Soviet Union and Hungary. In this a mutual sincere interest both in the successful implementation of the CPSU's course of restructuring of all spheres of life, and in implementing the aims of the program of socioeconomic stabilization adopted in Hungary, was expressed.

At the focus of our attention were issues connected with the further development and deepening of relations between the Soviet Union and Hungary in light of the accords reached at the meetings between M.S. Gorbachev and J. Kadar, and also at the meetings of the heads of Government of the USSR and Hungary in 1986 and 1987.

Soviet-Hungarian relations are, on the whole, developing dynamically, despite unfavorable tendencies in the world market and the fall in price for many Soviet export goods, the volume of trade between our countries has continued to rise.

Our cooperation is of an equal and mutually beneficial nature. The common aims and the proximity of directions in which the processes of renewal are progressing in the Soviet Union and in Hungary create confidence in the future of bilateral cooperation.

At the same time, the need for deepening socialist integration and for considerable enhancement of the efficiency of mutual cooperation of a kind which would be in line with the transformations being carried out in our countries, insistently demands a constant search for fresh approaches and the elaboration of fresh forms of cooperation.

It was to these issues that the main attention was paid in the course of the negotiations over the past few days with K. Grosz. Running through our talks was the theme of how to organize cooperation during the next 5-year period. As you will realize, this requires substantial preparatory work. For this reason questions relating to the development of trade and economic links in the remaining 2 years of the current 5-year plan period were also examined, since to a considerable degree they determine the basis for our relations in the ensuing period.

As a result of the exchange of views with the chairman of the Council of Ministers and members of the Hungarian Government agreement was reached on the specific areas of the work which we are intending to organize through the state planning committees and other economic organizations and departments of our countries. Government bodies will monitor the progress of this work.

As for the future outlook, we are proceeding on the basis of a number of coordinated principled positions. First and foremost the level of our cooperation that has already been achieved and the traditional economic links between our countries are a firm and reliable basis for further progress. This creates confidence that Hungary's national economy will be guaranteed resources. We confirmed that the present level of fuel and raw materials supplies from the Soviet Union to the Hungarian People's Republic will be maintained in the next 5-year plan period. Then we are convinced that as restructuring in the Soviet Union and the programs that have been drawn up by the Hungarian Government are put into effect we shall be able to discover new reserves and to find a solution to many issues in our cooperation.

Our common task consists in creating a more progressive structure of economic exchanges which would stem from technological progress in our countries, and from joint work on implementation of the comprehensive program for scientific and technological progress of the CEMA countries. It is this direction of our joint efforts which should provide fresh impetus for Soviet-Hungarian economic ties.

To this end we shall have to fully adopt and expand direct coproduction, form new joint enterprises, and promote in every way the development of direct production ties and close contact and cooperation between labor collectives in our countries.

These forms of cooperation open up the way of deepenig of economic integration with other CEMA countries as well.

We have now taken the first steps, but steps of fundamental importance, in this sphere. Eight joint enterprises, 19 scientific research collectives and two international Soviet-Hungarian associations have been formed. On the whole, direct ties between industrial enterprises and scientific research organizations of our countries are developing quite well, with more than 120 partners already involved in them. Direct goods exchange between Hungary and a number of union republics of the USSR is bearing good fruit. But the economic returns on these ties could be even higher. Additional opportunities in this context will be furnished by the opening of branches of the Hungarian trade mission in Leningrad, Kiev and Tbilisi, on which we have reached accord. Today an agreement between our countries on development of reciprocal exchange of consumer goods implemented between internal trading and consumer cooperative enterprises and organizations, will be signed.

The success of all this work must be furthered in a substantial manner by the concept of the development of economic and scientific-technical cooperation between the USSR and Hungary for 15-20 years, the drawing up of which concept is nearing completion. It will become the fundamental basis for improving the mechanism of national economic links in the long term.

In the current 5-year plan period, the available reserves are being brought into action in other areas of cooperation too—whether it be the sphere of culture, science, education, health care and tourism or the development of contacts between republics, oblasts and towns, cross-border exchange and contact between people. The signing will take place today of a supplementary protocol to the intergovernmental agreement on the conditions for mutual nonvisa trips by citizens, dated 24 November 1987, which protocol will open up new opportunities for visiting relatives, holidays and medical treatment, and tourist trips by young people.

The main thing is to give urgent and immediate effect to what has been planned. Our joint efforts will then bear fruit.

While in Budapest, I cannot, however, fail to mention that the appeal of the Warsaw Pact member states adopted here 2 years ago not only fully maintains its topicality, but has even gained fresh impetus for translation into the plane of practical accords. Advocating the substantial reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe, we declared our readiness to exchange the relevant data with the NATO countries in the very nearest future and to embark on the elimination on a reciprocal basis of the existing asymmetries and imbalances, both on a European scale and region by region. At the same time, the more than cool response of the West to the proposal made in Sofia to openly exchange data on armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals prompts the question: does NATO really have any interest in establishing military equilibrium at a lower level, or are they guided by something else, perhaps by an unwillingness to sort out in an honest way the unsubstantiated nature of the claim of an "overwhelming advantage of the East?"

During our talks we exchanged opinions on key issues of international relations. I must say that the Soviet side appreciates highly the fact that we and Hungary have a united approach to all the fundamental aspects of the situation in Europe and the world. This approach is based on the new foreign policy thinking, to which there is no alternative. It is founded on our mutual dedication to the ideals of a nuclear-free and nonviolent world, the road to which, we are jointly convinced, lies via the implementation of an all-embracing system of international peace and security.

I do not think there is any need to set forth in detail the stand of our countries on the whole spectrum of international issues, since these have already been mentioned in the speeches at the official banquet in the parliament. Besides, these issues are analyzed thoroughly in the documents of the session of the Foreign Ministers' Committee of the Warsaw Pact member states held in Sofia at the end of March.

I would like to reaffirm again that the Soviet Union, like the other Warsaw Pact countries, will not slacken its efforts in the matter of further developing and strengthening positive tendencies in the international atmosphere.

The results of our visit to the Hungarian People's Republic are reflected in a joint communique to be published. Without a doubt, they will serve the further deepening of fraternal relations and promote all-around cooperation between the Soviet Union and Hungary.

In conclusion I would like to wish our Hungarian hosts and all citizens of this friendly country and of its capital, Budapest, peace and prosperity and success in socialist construction.

K. Grosz then spoke. He said that N.I. Ryzhkov's visit had been exceptionally useful. I am perfectly happy with the results of the talks, he said. The great interest of the Soviet leadership in the events taking place in Hungary and in the Hungarian experience has a beneficial effect on the development of the socioeconomic process in the Hungarian People's Republic. The sincere atmosphere of the talks that were held makes it possible to say that we make the same appraisal of the changes taking place in the world. Both countries see the need for further perfecting relations between the countries of the socialsit community, including Soviet-Hungarian ties.

K. Grosz dwell on Hungarian domestic issues, noting the importance of strengthening Soviet-Hungarian cooperation in all spheres.

He said that the significance of the radical transformations in the Soviet Union go far beyond the context of the USSR, and exert an influence on the life of the fraternal states.

The chairman of the Hungarian Council of Ministers stated that the Hungarian people fully support the USSR's constructive initiatives aimed at ensuring reliable peace, reducing arms, and at disarmament.

N.I. Ryzhkov and K. Grosz replied to numerous questions from journalists.

Today N.I. Ryzhkov left Budapest for Moscow. The following officials accompanying him left at the same time: A.K. Antonov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; N.A. Pugin, USSR minister of the automotive industry; A.G. Kovalev, USSR first deputy foreign minister; and A.I. Lukashov, deputy chairman of the USSR Gosplan.

They were accompanied to the airport, which was decorated with the Soviet and Hungarian state flags, by K. Grosz, J. Marjai, and other officials.

S. Rajnai, Hungarian ambassador to the Soviet Union, and B.I. Stukalin, Soviet ambassador to Hungary, were among those present.

At the airport in Moscow N.I. Ryzhkov was met by A.N. Yakovlev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; N.V. Talyzin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; V.S. Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; and other officials.

J. Barabas, Hungarian charge d'affaires ad interim in the Soviet Union, was among those present.

Further on Remarks

LD210227 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 20 Apr 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today, Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov and Karoly Grosz, member of the Politburo of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party Central Committee, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Hungarian People's Republic, held a news conference in Budapest for Hungarian and foreign journalists.

Addressing the audience, Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov said, among other things:

[Begin Ryzhkov recording] The time has evidently come to summarize the results of this friendly visit to the Hungarian People's Republic. Let me say outright that we are pleased with what we managed to achieve during these brief days. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the leadership of the Hungarian People's Republic, the managers of enterprises and the labor collectives whom we have met over the last few days for their fraternal, warm and cordial welcome. [end recording]

Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov described his impressions of the days he had spent on Hungarian soil and his meetings with Hungarian working people. He stressed that labor collectives in the fraternal republic had a profound commitment to seeing their enterprises achieve high results in their work, and he emphasized their enterprising attitude, creative endeavor, intensive labor rhythm, and responsibility. He spoke highly of the experience of the Hungarian friends, who had been able to ensure a decisive role for the effectiveness of public-sector production and the human factor.

Comrade Ryzhkov spoke about the new prospects that were opening up for the further development and deepening of relations between the Soviet Union and Hungary in light of the accords reached at meetings between Comrades Gorbachev and Kadar, as well as of the heads of the Governments of the USSR and the Hungarian People's Republic, in 1986-87.

Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov and Karoly Grosz then replied to questions from journalists.

[Begin recording] [Shirokov] Yevgeniy Shirokov, Soviet television. I have a question for Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov. What practical results for the development of Soviet-Hungarian cooperation might there be as a result of the talks and meetings that have just taken place? Where will attention primarily be focused?

[Ryzhkov] I would single out motor vehicle production among other questions, of which there were several under discussion. Three countries had expressed a desire to create special capacities for the production of 150,000 new Zaporozhets vehicles: the USSR, Hungary, and Bulgaria. The idea is that after the capacities are built and production starts, each of the sides would have 50,000 vehicles per annum.

I would like to say, first of all, that they are very good vehicles, and we think that in principle they are, overall, no worse than Japanese vehicles. There were a number of questions that had obstructed a final accord. These matters were resolved during the visit. I do not think we should go into the mathematics of who went how far to accommodate the others. the most important thing was the goodwill we had; and we found this solution. We hope that a final agreement will be signed in May, and that the building of capacities will start [words indistinct] the work was very intensive. [end recording]

Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov and Karoly Grosz replied to other questions from journalists.

Also today, Comrade Ryzhkov left Budapest for Moscow. At the airport, which was decorated with the state flags of the USSR and the Hungarian People's Republic, he was seen off by Comrade Grosz and other officials.

'Joint Communique' on Visit

PM201705 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Apr 88 Morning Edition pp 1, 4

["Joint Communique on the Official Friendly Visit to the Hungarian People's Republic by N.I. Ryzhkov, Member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers"—IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] At the invitation of the MSZMP Central Committee and the Hungarian Council of Ministers N.I. Ryzhkov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR Council of Ministers chairman, was in Hungary 18-20 April 1988 on an official friendly visit.

The Soviet head of government was received by J. Kadar, MSZMP general secretary, and K. Nemeth, president of the Hungarian Presidential Council.

Talks were held between N.I. Ryzhkov and K. Grosz, MSZMP Central Committee Politburo member and chairman of the Hungarian Council of Ministers, with the participation of the following:

On the Soviet side—A.K. Antonov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; N.A. Pugin, USSR minister of the automotive industry; A.G. Kovalev, USSR first deputy foreign minister; A.I. Lukashov, deputy chairman of the USSR Gosplan; and B.I. Stukalin, USSR ambassador to Hungary;

On the Hungarian side—J. Marjai, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and Hungarian minister of trade; F. Berecz, Hungarian minister of industry; G. Horn, state secretary at the Hungarian Foreign Ministry; L. Berenyi, deputy chairman of the Hungarian National Planning Office; and S. Rajnai, Hungarian ambassador to the USSR.

N.I. Ryzhkov visited the "Tungsram" electrical equipment enterprise and an instrument making cooperative in Budapest and the "Uj Elet" agricultural cooperative in Komarom Megye, and met with representatives of the Hungarian economic chamber and the Hungarian federation of scientific and technical societies. Wreaths were laid at the monument to Hungarian heroes who fell in the struggle for freedom and independence for their motherland, the monument to Soviet servicemen who died in the fighting for Hungary's liberation, and also the V.I. Lenin monument.

In the course of the meetings and conversations, which took place in an atmosphere of cordiality and friendship, there was a thorough exchange of information on preparations for the 19th All-Union Party Conference and the Hungarian National Party Conference. Discussion was centered on fundamental questions of socialist building in the Soviet Union and Hungary, the state of bilateral cooperation and prospects for its development, and also topical international problems.

N.I. Ryzhkov spoke of the large-scale processes of essentially revolutionary renewal of all spheres of Soviet society's life and progress in implementing the radical economic reform and profound democratization, which are the decisive avenues of the activity of the CPSU and the Soviet Government at the present stage of restructuring. K. Grosz spoke of current tasks in domestic policy, measures being adopted with the aim of stabilizing and developing the Hungarian economy and improving the system of political institutions, and tasks associated with extending democracy in the country. It was stressed that the renewal processes launched in the

Soviet Union and Hungary testify to socialism's vitality and are a response to the demands of the time—to uncover in full the creative potential of socialism and to endow it with a new quality.

The similarity of the goals of restructuring in the USSR and the reforms in Hungary opens up new prospects and potential for the further fruitful development of multifaceted bilateral cooperation, which meets the vital interests of both countries' peoples.

It was noted with satisfaction that Soviet-Hungarian relations, based on equality, autonomy, mutual respect and trust, consideration for each other's interests and the study of each other's experience, and international solidarity, are steadily developing and growing richer. Meetings and talks between M.S. Gorbachev and J. Kadar are of crucial significance for the deepening of friendship and cooperation between the two peoples and countries.

The main attention at the talks was devoted to the implementation of accords reached during meetings between the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and the MSZMP general secretary and the heads of government of the USSR and Hungary in 1986 and 1987, and to the examination of cardinal questions and specific avenues of Soviet-Hungarian economic cooperation. These accords, in the sides' assessment, are on the whole being put into practice as they should be, and the existing results are helping appreciably to fulfill the tasks facing the two countries' national economies.

The sides confirmed the growing significance of Soviet-Hungarian economic, scientific, and technical cooperation and expressed readiness to work in the interests of further developing it.

The state of reciprocal trade and payment relations between the two countries was examined in light of the effect of changes in the world market. There was a positive assessment of the accords reached on commodity deliveries and payments for 1988; it was agreed to continue taking steps to ensure balance in commodity exchange and accounts. On the basis of this year's results and the maintenance of the level of commodity exchange achieved, the two countries' relevant organs have been instructed to continue working to develop reciprocal trade on a balanced basis in 1989-1990.

In connection with the examination of the prospects for economic interaction, note was made of the great importance of the concept now being elaborated of the development of economic, scientific, and technical cooperation between the USSR and Hungary over a 15-20 year period. At the same time it was stressed that the attainment of the goals enshrined in the present document will promote the further strengthening of cooperation between the two countries, the improvement of the cooperation mechanism, the qualitative renewal of production in accordance with the demands of scientific and technical progress and the real needs of the two countries' national economies, the increasing of the competitiveness of current output on the world market, the improvement of economic efficiency and, on that basis, the growth in the population's prosperity. It is agreed to complete the work on the concept so that it acts as a guideline in the joint work of coordinating the plans for the development of the USSR and Hungarian national economies for 1991-1995.

The sides confirmed their interest in extending beyond 1990 the term of the intergovernmental agreements on cooperation in the spheres of the production of aluminum oxide and aluminum, chemical plant protection agents, and deliveries of Hungarian fruit and vegetables to the USSR.

There was an examination of progress in the implementation of certain large-scale cooperation agreements, including the expansion of the Paks Nuclear Power Station and the fulfillment of the two sides' commitments relating to Hungarian organizations' participation in the construction of facilities at the Tengizskoye oil and gas field.

The importance of developing mutually beneficial cooperation at enterprise level was stressed. It was noted that new forms such as direct ties between enterprises and joint enterprises and scientific research collectives are among the main ways of achieving a higher level of integration and will help to expand commodity exchange between the two countries, accelerate scientific and technical progress, and ensure the conditions necessary for improving output quality and raising production efficiency as a whole. An accord was reached on the elaboration of joint economic and organizational-legal decisions aimed at the comprehensive development of new forms of cooperation. It was agreed to expand direct trade-economic and scientific-technical ties between Hungary and a number of union republics.

A unanimous view was expressed on the need to make maximum use of the advantages of socialist international division of labor. In this context, the sides expressed themselves in favor of consistent progress along the path of the restructuring of the CEMA cooperation mechanism and of CEMA activities and of a stepped up effort in the implementation of the the Comprehensive Program for CEMA Countries' Scientific and Technical Progress Through the Year 2000 which is to promote the deepening of socialist economic integration.

The sides noted that the solution of such global problems of our century as environmental protection and rational use of natural resources is possible only on the basis of international cooperation. They agreed to sign an intergovernmental agreement on cooperation in this sphere during the current year.

The Soviet Union and Hungary favor the consistent expansion and enhancement of the effectiveness of all forms of direct ties between republics, oblasts, and cities and contacts between labor collectives of both countries, the development of cross-border exchanges, and a further simplification of the regulations governing private trips by Soviet and Hungarian citizens. The fruitful development of bilateral contacts in the sphere of science, education, culture, and Russian and Hungarian language teaching was noted.

During the discussion of wide-ranging international issues, the sides were united in their assessment of the situation in Europe and the world. They emphasized the importance of the new foreign policy thinking and expressed their resolve to continue to do everything possible in the interests of the consolidation of the positive trends in international relations.

The sides emphasized the historic importance of the Treaty on the Elimination of Soviet and U.S. Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles and expressed themselves in favor of its ratification at the earliest possible date.

Resolutely favoring the consistent continuation of the disarmament process, they attach particular importance to a conclusion in the near future of a treaty on 50-percent cuts in strategic offensive arms between the USSR and the United States on the condition that the sides observe the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972 and pledge not to withdraw from it during an agreed upon period. The conclusion of such an agreement would act as a powerful catalyst in the entire disarmament process and be a substantial step forward along the path of the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security as proposed to the international community by the socialist countries. The USSR and Hungary attach great importance to the upcoming third UN General Assembly special session on disarmament.

The sides believe that it is essential to strive for a reduction of armed forces and conventional arms in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals, the elaboration of a mandate for relevant negotiations, and the opening of such negotiations during 1988. Here special attention will have to be paid to the reduction of those types of weapons which constitute the basis of the armed forces' offensive potential, including dual-purpose means.

An important step in strengthening mutual trust would be the implementation of an exchange of information on armed forces and conventional arms of the Warsaw Pact and NATO in Europe as proposed in the appeal of the Warsaw Pact Foreign Ministers Committee session in Sofia.

The Soviet Union and Hungary are in favor of the dynamic development and deepening of the all-European process, which embraces a whole range of relations among states. The sides advocated the earliest conclusion of the Vienna meeting with results which on the basis of all the principles and provisions of the Helsinki Final Act would elevate all spheres of the all-European process to a qualitatively new level, advance real disarmament on the continent, make possible the further development of previously adopted confidence- and security-building measures and the drawing up of new ones, and serve as an effective incentive to deepening economic, scientific, and technical cooperation, collaboration in the sphere of culture and humanitarian ties, and the creation of an atmosphere of mutual understanding and respect.

The USSR and Hungary attach great importance to the implementation of the Warsaw Pact states' peace initiatives and welcome constructive proposals by other countries and political forces aimed at reducing armaments, building confidence, and creating zones free of nuclear and chemical weapons and zones of trust, cooperation, and good-neighborly relations. The Soviet side confirmed its support for the joint proposal of the MSZMP, the Finnish Social Democratic Party, and the Italian Socialist Party on active collaboration among states that do not possess nuclear weapons.

A high assessment was given to the signing of the documents on the political settlement surrounding Afghanistan, which may serve as an incentive to a peaceful negotiated settlement of other regional conflicts and crisis situations.

The visit saw the signing of an agreement between the Soviet and Hungarian Governments on the development of the reciprocal exchange of consumer goods among enterprises and organizations in the internal trade and consumer cooperative system and an additional protocol to the 24 November 1987 agreement between the Soviet and Hungarian Governments on the conditions for mutual visa-free trips by citizens.

N.I. Ryzhkov's official friendly visit to Hungary has helped strengthen the friendship between the Soviet and Hungarian peoples and opened up new opportunities for the further development of relations between the two countries in all spheres of life.

N.I. Ryzhkov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR Council of Ministers chairman, conveyed to K. Grosz, member of the MSZMP Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Hungarian Council of Ministers, an invitation for him to make an official friendly visit to the Soviet Union. The invitation was gratefully accepted.

Visit Evaluated

LD202134 Moscow International Service
in Hungarian 1900 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] In the first hours following the end of the visit it would be difficult to provide a far-reaching and comprehensive analysis of the results. These are reports in the official documents summing up the balance of the talks and meetings in Budapest. I would deal here with aspects which elicit a particularly great deal of attention. The most important ones appear to be points of principle, writes our commentator.

Premier Ryzhkov's program was noticeably businesslike, and this feature nowadays characterizes Soviet-Hungarian cooperation in general. In his toast delivered at a banquet in Parliament, the Soviet premier once again stated that the distinguishing feature of our relations is their content, their substantive, creative and open character. These words are supported not only by the atmosphere of the visit, but also by the rather rich program: His visit to Tungsram, the Precision Engineering Industrial Cooperative, the New Life Cooperative of Sarisap—that is, establishments where there is plenty to learn, where people are working with enthusiasm, in a creative manner, by making full use of the possibilities.

During the course of conversations the prospects of the further expansion of cooperation were always raised beside the present experiences. No one doubts nowadays that this cooperation meets the fundamental interests of the two countries, and the primary task is to make more efficient use of cooperation, especially since we clearly see the difficulties as well as the unexploited resources in our relations.

Nowadays, the common endeavors of the two countries are directed at the renewal and launch of the co-operation mechanism. Without this no progress can be made. During the course of discussions between the two premiers in Budapest this conclusion was clearly expressed. The plans and programs in this direction are already prepared or are in the process of being prepared. It is our common task to do our utmost to realize these tasks.

Our tasks are realistic and well-founded. Their realizations meet the interests of not only the two countries but the entire socialist community. In this respect Soviet Premier Nikolay Ryzhkov's visit to Hungary, the results of his meetings and discussions, represent a new step in this direction.

West Europe

More on Supreme Soviet Delegation in Strasbourg
LD211019 Moscow TASS in English 0957 GMT 21 Apr 88

[Text] Strasbourg April 21 TASS—A delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet (parliament) has had a meeting here with the members of the Bureau of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. A wide range of problems of establishing cooperation within the framework of the CSCE process in the field of humanitarian exchanges, the defence of human rights, environmental protection, culture, and health care was at the centre of attention.

The Soviet delegation set out the concept of a common European home, and pointed out the importance of coming to realise a common responsibility for the destiny of the continent in accordance with the principle of the new political thinking in the nuclear age, the principles which gradually enter international practice.

During a lively and frank conversation, the Soviet and European parliamentarians discussed most diverse aspects of the human rights concept, and continued the quest for a joint approach to solving the topical problems of cooperation in Europe.

The Bureau of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe with great interest regarded the Soviet side's proposals on specific forms of dialogue and, in particular, on joint symposiums, round-table meetings, and TV link-ups between the deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the members of the Parliamentary Asembly.

It is now important as never before to abandon stereotypes and recriminations and to begin constructive cooperation, for, despite the differences of political systems, there is the main thing: common concern and responsibility for the future of the continent, it was pointed out at the meeting.

The parliamentarians agreed to promote the implementation of measures to protect the environment, to ensure the safety of the nuclear power industry, to stimulate cultural exchanges, specifically through art festivals, get-togethers of young people, and to pool efforts in combatting drug addiction and AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome). Provision was made for the participation of the parliamentarians and experts of the two sides in joint elaboration of documents and recommendations on matters affecting the interests of all European countries. Measures were also planned for mutual information in the field of humanitarian exchanges and human rights.

The two delegations expressed common satisfaction with the results of the meeting. The members of the Bureau of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe accepted with gratitude an invitation to pay a reply visit to the Soviet Union.

"The first visit by the delegation of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR is extremely important and truly historic because if signifies the beginning of a fundamentally new stage in the development of relations between Soviet and West European parliamentarians", Louis Jung, president of the Parliamentary Asembly of the Council of Europe, has said in an interview with a TASS correspondent.

"It is perfectly evident that our meeting will be continued. Today we reached consensus: We all belong to Europe. This is why there is a whole number of questions which we can solve only together. Drawing lessons from the past, we should look into the future with confidence and optimism", he emphasised.

"It is symbolic that the first meeting between the deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe was held on the eve of our organisation's 40th jubilee which will be marked next year", Louis Jung said in concluison.

Tolkunov To Visit Council of Europe Assembly
LD211001 Moscow TASS in English 0916 GMT 21 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 21 TASS—Lev Tolkunov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet, left Moscow for Paris today at the invitation of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe.

Voss-Led Parliamentarians End Visit to Britain
LD202023 Moscow TASS in English 1708 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] London April 20 TASS—TASS correspondent Yuriy Levchenko reports:

A group of deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet concluded a visit to Great Britain. The group consists of Chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities Avgust Voss, Deputies Yevgeniy Velikhov and Valentina Tereshkova.

The Soviet parliamentarians participated in a World Conference of Parliamentary and Spiritual Leaders for the survival of humanity held in Oxford last week. Over five days more than 200 prominent politicians and religious leaders from various countries discussed the questions of ridding the world of the threat of nuclear holocaust, the ways of resolving global problems and of preserving nature. The final declaration contains the call to the broadest sections of the population to join actively in the struggle for these noble goals.

Upon the conclusion of the conference the Soviet parliamentarians stopped over for three days in London. They were guests of Speaker of the House of Commons of British Parliament Bernard Weatherill. They had an intensive programme of meetings and conversations with British colleagues, with leading statesmen and politicians, representatives of academic and public organisations. The Soviet parliamentarians were received by British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and by Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs Geoffrey Howe. There was a joint debate in Parliament with members of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Commons on prospects of widening and deepening the process of nuclear disarmament, of the development of Soviet-British contacts. A dinner was given in Parliament in honour of the Soviet guests.

At the final press conference, Avgust Voss spoke highly of the exchange of opinions held, pointed to the importance of the further development of Anglo-Soviet exchanges and cooperation in every area for the deepening of mutual understanding between the two countries and peoples, easing of tension in Europe and the world, for the establishment of business cooperation among all countries.

Speaker of the House of Commons Bernard Weatherill expressed much satisfaction over the results of the visit. In an interview to the TASS correspondent he said it was not the first meeting between British MPs and Soviet colleagues. He said he had met with Soviet parliamentarians during his trip to Moscow last year. He noted that good and warm relations, which can be described as friendly, had then been established. It is a good thing when elected representatives of the people meet each other to discuss vital problems, he noted. This is an earnest of their successful solution. There is a saying in Britain: "Coming together is a beginning, keeping together leads to progress, working together—to success. Now we are working to succeed, and I mean every word of it", he said.

The delegation of Soviet parliamentarians left for home today.

Kohl Submits Draft Documents on Foreign Policy

LD202121 Moscow TASS in English 2045 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] Bonn April 20 TASS—TASS correspondent Vladimir Serov reports:

Chairman of the Christian Democratic Union, FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl and General Secretary of the CDU Heiner Geissler today submitted here the draft fundamental documents on foreign and socio-economic policy endorsed by the board of the CDU, one of the ruling parties of the FRG. They will be submitted to the CDU congress to be held in Wiesbaden in June.

Presenting the draft documents on the foreign policy to journalists, Chancellor Helmut Kohl emphasized, specifically, that the Christian Democratic Union is striving for the development of cooperation and confidence building with the USSR and other Warsaw-Treaty countries. It is said in the draft document that relations with the Soviet Union are of cardinal importance for the FRG and that political changes taking place in the USSR open chances for the widening of the dialogue, cooperation and relaxation of tension in East-West relations.

The Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles is an important step on the road to genuine disarmament, it is emphasized in the section of the draft document dealing with problems of security and disarmament. Therefore it is necessary to use the opportunities the treaty opens for the advance on this road. Among these opportunities are a 50-per cent cut in strategic offensive potentials of the USA and the USSR, a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons, reduction in tactical nuclear arms with a range of up to 500 km, the creation of stability in the area of conventional armaments all over Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals.

Making calls for a world with smaller volumes of armaments, the draft document at the same time insists that nuclear weapons should be preserved. Nuclear weapons are regarded as "the necessary element of the strategy of nuclear deterrence". The draft document also contains an untenable thesis about the "military menace from the East" and alleged "preponderance of Warsaw Treaty countries in conventional armaments". It should be noted that "modernization" of NATO nuclear arms is proclaimed in the CDU document as "an indispensable composite part of the deterrence strategy".

Austria's Lichal Visits Moscow Military Unit

PM201059 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Apr 88 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Visit Continues"]

[Text] R. Lichal, Austrian federal defense minister, who is in the Soviet Union on an official visit, visited a Moscow Military District unit on 13 April. He met with Soviet servicemen and attended a tactical exercise.

R. Lichal was accompanied by Colonel General D.A. Grinkevich, chief of the Main Staff and deputy commander in chief of the Ground Forces.

Zaykov Receives Italian Friendship Group Leader

LD201725 Moscow TASS in English 1452 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 20 TASS—Lev Zaykov, a member of the Politburo and a secretary of the CPSU Central Committee who is also first secretary of the Moscow City Party Committee, today received Vincenzo Corghi, secretary-general of the Italy-USSR Friendship Society.

In their conversation, which passed in a friendly atmosphere, they discussed some issues of trade, economic cooperation and cultural relations between the Soviet Union and Italy.

Belgian Report on Soviet Customs Service

LD201721 Moscow TASS in English 1020 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 20 TASS—The reportage which was published in the Soviet newspaper GUDOK about the functioning of Soviet customs service in the city of Brest, Belorussia, prompted Nathalie Bashkatoff, a Belgian woman journalist, whose name was mentioned in the reportage, to write an article which has appeared in LE SOIR newspaper.

Her article points out, in particular, that in August 1986 she went to Moscow by train. When crossing the border, she told customs officers that she had with her files which had been compiled from clippings taken out of Soviet and Western periodicals and which were essential for her for professional purposes. The files were withdrawn for verification and later on returned to her with the exception of some clippings from LE MONDE and LE SOIR newspapers and PARIS-MATCH magazine. Bashkatoff maintains in her article that she was not given any document with a list of materials withdrawn from her.

TASS, which through its channels circulated the reportage of GUDOK newspaper, does not question the correctness of the version of the Belgian woman journalist.

Supreme Soviet Group in Malta Meets Leaders

LD201801 Moscow TASS in English 1528 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] Valletta April 20 TASS—A delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet, which arrived here on Tuesday on an official visit, had a meeting today with the acting President of the Republic Paul Xuereb and members of the Maltese Parliament.

Special attention during the conversations was drawn to the international situation, in particular to the situation in the Mediterranean. Paul Xuereb stressed the big importance of the proposals concerning the Mediterranean made by Mikhail Gorbachev in Belgrade. He also expressed concern over the situation in the Middle East, noting that Malta stands for the holding of an international conference with the participation of all the interested sides to solve the dangerous conflict there.

The Maltese members of Parliament unanimously noted that they support the Soviet initiatives in the international arena, including the proposals concerning the Mediterranean. Malta wants this region to become a zone of peace and cooperation and not of confrontation, they said. This is important not only for Malta, which is in the centre of the Mediterranean, but also for the world as a whole. The members of Parliament stressed that at present the international climate has considerably improved, especially in the light of the signing of the Soviet-American INF Treaty.

The head of the Soviet delegation Tenghiz Menteshashvili, secretary of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, briefed the head of the Maltese Republic on the process of perestroyka in the Soviet Union and on the latest Soviet initiatives in the international arena.

Latin America & Caribbean

Further Remarks of Chile's Corvalan on Vote

PY202014 Moscow in Spanish to Chile 2030 GMT 16 Apr 88

[Second of two part article by Communist Party of Chile, PCCh, Secretary General Luis Corvalan: "On the Plebiscite"]

[Text] Important political changes never depended much on the vote, not even under the most democratic regimes, and will never occur under the fascist regime we are suffering.

The great electoral events that represented or facilitated a significant step forward in the political and social development of the country have always been supported by a large mobilization of the people.

The ousting of the right from the government and the arrival of the Christian Democratic Party—and later the Popular Unity—were not the result of simple elections. The coming to power of the new social and political forces as a result of the 1970 and 1974 presidential elections was above all the result of the sustained struggle against the oligarchy, a struggle for the rights of the workers and the people.

The new social and political forces came to power during the flourishing of the labor and popular movement, during the flourishing of the peasant struggle for agrarian reform and the nationalization of copper, and during the great development of the student movement that imposed the university reforms.

This is why the idea of reducing the struggle simply to registering voters and voting no in the plebiscite means restricting the battle zone, having an illusion of victory, and working for a victory that would not have the force needed to oust the dictator. In the Philippines, Haiti, and all countries where tyrants like Marcos and Duvalier were thrown out, it was necessary to have a strong and permanent popular and national struggle.

Pinochet insists that whatever the outcome of the plebiscite, the fascist Constitution imposed 8 years ago will be strictly enforced. No one is going to take him out of that stubborn position. In case the no vote wins, the leftist parties, the Christian Democratic Party, and other centrist organizations believe that Pinochet cannot continue another year in the government, that the 1980 Constitution cannot remain inflexible, that a partially appointed congress cannot be accepted, and that having the military in an advisory role over a civilian power resulting from the will of the people also cannot be accepted.

Therefore, the plebiscite appears as some kind of confrontation with the dictatorship, but the result of this confrontation will not basically depend on the vote. Pinochet intends to remain in power anyway, and he has no other idea in his head.

The brutal statement by Gerardo Alvarez, cabinet chief of Magallanes Intendency, that those people who do not want to obey the Constitution if the no vote wins will be killed, represents the fascist thought that prevails in the high leadership of the regime.

Pinochet himself said in a speech on 11 March that the victory of the people who reject or disagree with the current institutional order would generate a conflict of unpredictable, negative consequences. The statements of Matthei and Merino that the plebiscite will be respected, whatever its result, and that a victory of the no vote would not represent chaos, indicate some difference with Pinochet's remarks. But their statements do not justify in any way the enthusiam of some politicians because if the no vote wins, the main and great problem would be to open the way toward democracy, to start to shape a provisional government and an assembly or national congress with constituent powers, for these are issues that are rejected not only by Pinochet but also by Merino and Matthei.

In such a situation, the plebiscite could be an important landmark in the struggle for democracy, not so much because of the victory of the no vote, but because of the outcome of the conflict that would arise between those who, using the fascist Constitution as a prop, would like to leave everything as it is and those who would demand an immediate change in accordance with national aspirations.

If the plebiscite goes against the dictator, the 13 parties that support a no vote propose to reach an agreement with the Armed Forces seeking a quick and orderly transition to democracy.

We do not see the possibility of the military institutions voluntarily accepting any type of agreement in this respect. If at some point they do accept, they will do so with the fixed idea of demanding, before anything else is discussed, that the democratic forces do not dig into the human rights violations committed during this period, something that the people will never accept.

We cannot offhandedly reject the possibility of an understanding with the Armed Forces, but we have to understand that an agreement that will really favor democracy must be the outcome of a struggle by the people that has been provoked due to the circumstances that have been imposed.

There will come a time when the popular masses will have to revert to a state of general insurbodination. They will have to take to the streets and take over the large cities to force the Armed Forces, which most probably at that time will have new commanders, to change their attitude.

This could happen if the no vote wins or if there is evidence of fraud, and especially if the opposition, led by the left, continually adopts an offensive stance in those circumstances, and if it stimulates social mobilization without hesitation.

Some support continuity with Pinochet, others without him. This has been demonstrated by the recent and shocking public bickering within the National Renewal Party.

Fraud in the elections [words indistinct] is seen by the public as an illustrative incident within the great fraud that the regime has mounted so it can manipulate the plebiscite.

There are also some people, including military men, who are willing to help in the transition to democracy, and there are others who oppose it with all their might.

The struggle of the masses and the offensive actions of the opposition must be carried out in such a way that they are a danger to the regime's stability.

These contradictions must be made more acute, and they must then be converted into an objective factor favorable to the democratic cause; otherwise, Pinochet will be able to resolve them in his favor, as has happened on other occasions.

What happened with Matthei is highly enlightening. Last year, with a certain conceit, and believing that he had his own options, he pompously stated that he preferred to submit the name of a civilian to the plebiscite, and he even set an age: 52. He recently confessed that this would not be possible. Sometimes, he told reporters, one has a beautiful ideal, but afterward one has to carry out his task politically. It is clear that Matthei has given in.

In any case, can one really expect anything from Brigadier General Humberto Gordon, who does what his boss tells him, or from Merino or Stange, who are also expressing their opinions, and who definitely want only a continuation of the dictatorship and do not want to annoy the dictator?

Only a multiform struggle by the people, only an intense, combative, ever-increasing, and multitudinous social mobilization, carried over and beyond the plebiscite, can and must generate the rupture that is needed.

Sooner or later, this rupture will be inevitable, and it will most probably take place through a national uprising.

The Constitution that was in effect until 11 September 1973 provided for the succession of the government, and even for the replacement of the president of the Republic before the end of his term. The reactionary coalition that was organized then, the CODE [Confederation of Democracy], with the outstanding participation of the Christian Democratic Party, lacked sufficient social force to win the March 1973 elections, and the number of congressmen it needed to (?unleash) an institutional coup.

Under these circumstances, the Chilean reactionary group, committed to U.S. imperialism, resorted to a bloody fascist putsch, and led the Armed Forces into a war against the people that will not end until the end of the tyranny.

The change from a democratic regime to a fascist dictatorship has thus represented a clear and open institutional disruption. Now, the return to democracy will represent another disruption, but one that is justified and necessary.

The fascist Constitution is unamendable without Pinochet's consent, and he has not, nor will he ever, agree to this. Moreover, this Constitution allows one man to rule for 24 years and the Armed Forces to become a superpower through the National Security Council. In other words, the government succession is rather illusory under Pinochet's institutional policy, and the return to democracy is not possible.

Last summer, and afterwards, important mobilizations took place. Among the most important ones, we can mention the stoppages and strikes of temporary workers, the struggle of PEM [Minimum Salary Program] workers, the elections within the coal workers unions, the struggle of teachers against dismissals, the demonstrations against the municipalization of clinics, the occupation of properties in several cities, the blackouts and other paramilitary actions, the hunger strikes on behalf of the five people who have been missing since September 1987, and the demonstrations throughout the country on 8 March. Moreover, relatives of missing detainees, of those executed, of political prisoners, of those who have returned to the country, of the exiles, and members of the Sebastian Acevedo Movement Against Torture continue their heroic and tenacious struggle for humam rights.

University professors and students are resuming the battle. Those from the University of Chile intend to reorganize the movement that (?supported) Federicci, and to win the struggle to defend their university. Workers, whether active or retired, are mobilizing themselves, and getting ready to fight their own battle for higher wages, and against the increase in the cost of living and the loss of purchasing power of their salaries, wages, pensions, and allowances.

The National Workers Command [CNT] has presented a new list of petitions, and has scheduled a new general strike. A struggle is under way for the democratization of neighborhood committees.

There is a continuous struggle by reporters for freedom of the press and for the release of ANALISIS Director Juan Pablo Cardenas and against arbitrary trials and sentences. Artists and scholars are also engaging in a constant struggle against the threats to which they are subjected by government terrorist gangs.

The voices of courageous Catholic bishops, priests, and nuns are raised. Successful actions by Christian communities are mounted against the excesses and abuses of dictatorship, and in favor of the citizens' common interests and ideals.

We see the possibility of a change, especially in the vigorous development of the social and multifaceted movement. Our main concern now is to keep stimulating it.

We hope for an advanced democratic regime, although this is not our main goal. The most important thing is to eliminate dictatorship, to eradicate it as soon as possible, to take advantage of the plebiscite to undermine it. Even if the plebiscite represents a path toward a bourgeois democracy, we will consider it a step in the struggle for democracy. But we are doing so with the absolute conviction that without a struggle, without coordinated and joint action by all anti-dictatorial forces, there will be no solution, not even a moderate solution. To encourage this struggle and to promote this action, each political and social sector, regardless of the position from which it starts, are the two main goals, which must be achieved as soon as possible.

In conclusion, regarding the plebiscite, there are different views within the opposition. Some have decided to participate in it, seeking what they call a civilized solution, that is, without the people's revolt, without engaging the people in uncontrolled agitation. Other sectors that are participating say their position is one of realism, which it is not. They believe that the situation cannot be changed, that the people's struggle cannot be yield positive results.

We do not share this viewpoint, although we support the different stands taken by those who advocate the no vote, and especially by those who view the no vote as break with the past.

We have not, and will not, take any stand that involves paving the way for conciliation or recognizing democratic features in the plebiscite, features the plebiscite does not have. We do not believe that everything will be decided by the plebiscite.

If the plebiscite is finally called, we will do our utmost to unite the different methods of struggle, including those related to the plebiscite, into a single drive, a redoubtable and bold political and social drive in order to achieve the great objective of ending the dictatorship and throwing out the dictator.

We are not concealing our concern for the United Left. The Christian Democratic Party has been publicly and secretly working to arrange things in their own interests by endorsing a solution without the participation of the Communists, a moderate, conciliatory solution, with the approval of the U.S. State Department.

It is clear to us that the United Left parties that have reached agreement with the center opposition parties have not tried to play into the Christian Democratic Party's and the U.S. State Department's hands. However, the fact is, they have taken a position without awaiting the conclusion of discussions within the coalition we are forming together.

This has caused a negative impact. For the time being, the United Left has been debilitated as an opposition coalition. It now appears to have less power. The crisis affecting the United Left has had repercussions on the mass organizations in which some people are trying to establish a sharp difference between the Communists, the Chilean Socialist Party historic faction, and the MIR [Movement of the Revolutionary Left], and the parties that have supported the no vote. This does not contribute, to say the least, to a social drive.

Convinced of interpreting the people's hopes and interests, we will continue our efforts to strengthen and develop the United Left because it is the best alternative for power. We will do our utmost to restore good relations and unrestricted confidence among all its members.

Beyond the attacks against it and the evils that have affected it from time to time, the left has been and is an indestructible reality, the expression of the most advanced beliefs of the Chilean people.

Being the most consistent democratic force, the left has a lot to do in the struggle for a true democracy, for the total eradication of the national security doctrine, for achieving substantial changes that are required in the state's economic infrastructure, in the distribution of income, in education, in health, and in other fields.

In the past, the left was in power. In the future, the left will be called to assume even greater responsibilities.

The Chilean left will have to overcome stumbling blocks in order to assume its responsibilities and make the country return to the path of the democratic, anti-imperialist, anti-oligarchic revolution, which was taken by the people under the Salvador Allende administration, with socialism as their goal.

Chilean Student Strike Called for 28-29 Apr

PY201412 Moscow Radio Magallanes in Spanish to Chile 0200 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] A national university student strike has been called for 28 and 29 April. The strike has been organized by the CONFECH [Chilean Student Confederation] in compliance with the unanimous decision of the country's 26 University Federations.

The strike has been called to protest cuts in university budgets, to repudiate the firing of teachers and employees, and to condemn the persecution that is being suffered by students and leaders.

CONFECH has called for the support of any future initiative to be carried out by the National Workers Command [CNT] and by the Civic Assembly.

CONFECH has also suggested to the CNT and the Civic Assembly the need to call a national strike during the third week of May to defend the salaries and wages of the workers.

The CONFECH is participating in all the assemblies and meetings that are being held to prepare the 1 May celebrations.

The country's university students are preparing to celebrate the 20th anniversary of university reform. The anniversary will be celebrated throughout the nation and it will be called: "Chile Creates University," which has provoked interest in Chile and the world.

CONFECH is also preparing its Third Congress of Chilean University Students that is to be held in July or August 1988, in other words, a permanent mobilization of the youth that includes young labor leaders and slum dwellers.

Of course, if there is a plebiscite, CONFECH urges everyone to vote no, but, as the 13 youth groups of the Movement for Democracy have urged, a no that will do away with the dictatorship and bring free elections without Pinochet.

IPU Forum on Central America Held in Guatemala

PM210955 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Apr 88 Morning Edition p4

[TASS correspondent Aleksandr Trushin report: "Parliamentarians' Main Tasks"]

[Excerpts] Guatemala, 13 Apr—The struggle to prevent a nuclear catastrophe and other vital problems of the modern world are the focus of attention of delegates to the 79th IPU conference, which is being held in the Guatemalan capital. Addressing the conference, L.K. Shepetis, member of the USSR Parliamentary Group delegation, secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, and chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet, pointed out that parliamentarians in different countries can make an important contribution to the task of strengthening peace and creating an atmosphere of trust in interstate relations.

The Soviet Union, L.K. Shepetis said, consistently works to end the nuclear and conventional arms race once and for all and to pave the way to a nuclear-free, non-violent world through common efforts.

The participants in the conference have begun discussing an additional point on the agenda concerning the prospects of achieving peace, democracy, and economic and social development in Central America. The representatives of a number of Latin American countries condemned U.S. interference in Central America and the United States' hostile actions against Panama. [passage omitted]

The Soviet Union, A.S. Yeliseyev, head of the USSR Parliamentary Group delegation and deputy chairman of the Parliamentary Group, said in his speech at the conference, attaches great significance to resolving conflicts in various regions. There is no one solution that would settle all regional conflicts, but the idea of national reconciliation must be fundamental to any settlement, including in achievement of peace in Central America.

It is now particularly important to prevent any break in the process of a political settlement that has begun in Central America and to place a barrier in the way of those who are still in favor of using methods of force to solve the region's problems, thereby flouting the generally accepted norms of international law. The unity of all forces sincerely interested in solving the Central American conflict by peaceful, political means is acquiring great importance. An important role in this can and must be played by parliamentarians, A.S. Yeliseyev said.

The IPU conference is continuing work.

Political & Social

Shcherbitskiy Addresses Ukrainian Party Plenum

AU181046 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 9 Apr 88 pp 1-2

[Unattributed report on speech delivered by V.V. Shcherbitskiy, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary, at the 8 April plenum of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee—boldface as published]

[Text] Three years have passed since the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum that defined the policy of restructuring and of accelerating our society's socioeconomic development. In that period great changes have taken place all over the country, including in our republic, on the basis of democratization in all spheres of social life.

An active process of intellectual renewal is in progress, the very atmosphere in society and people's spirits has changed. A radical economic reform has been launched, and the rates of economic development have significantly increased. A change for the better is taking place in accomplishing immediate social tasks. The new way of political thinking is also gaining an increasingly firm hold in international relations.

In this way **restructuring as a way of thinking and acting, is permeating life more and more deeply and thus determining the character of social consciousness and of our entire practical work. This is the main political result of the last 3 years.**

The party and the people support restructuring, and this process is undoubtedly irreversible. But there are also hindering forces, in essence, anti-restructuring forces.

A profound analysis of the progress made in restructuring and of its results, V.V. Shcherbitskiy pointed out, and well-substantiated criticism of the platform and moods of antisocialist forces were offered in a recent PRAVDA editorial. I am confident we all agree that the article "The Restructuring Principles: the Revolutionary Character of Thinking and Acting" is of great political importance, is mandatory in character, and its theses have to be adopted for guidance in one's everyday work.

To accomplish the great and responsible immediate tasks, it is now more essential than ever for everyone, always and everywhere, to be enterprising and persistent, to observe party and state discipline, and to bear great personal responsibility for implementing all plans, for the destiny of restructuring.

These requirements also fully apply to **restructuring in higher and secondary schools.** What is to be done concretely in this respect has been stated in Comrade Yu.N. Yelchenko's report and in the plenum's draft decision. In my opinion, the speeches delivered at the plenum were interesting and rich in content.

Many sensible suggestions and critical remarks have been made in the letters sent by the working people to republic-level bodies and mass media, as well as during the discussion at this plenum. It is essential to examine them and to take them into account, and—what matters most—to set about implementing all plans everywhere, and in a well-concerted way.

In this connection, it is to be emphasized that, to restructure the school, it is necessary to accomplish tasks that in their very essence are interdepartmental and nationwide tasks. We regard public education councils, which are now being set up in the field, as a concrete mechanism to exert people's influence on the activity of educational institutions, a mechanism to democratize the entire system of education. Of course, such councils must be composed of prestigious and competent people who represent not a department, but the wide public of a village, a rayon or a city.

We must also bear in mind that the main line of the young people's ideological and political tempering lies in the sphere of public education. But the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo's recent examination of the work performed by the Ukrainian Komsomol Central Committee to restructure the ideological and moral education of young people showed that deep, radical changes for the better still have not taken place in this respect. But, after all, the struggle for young people's hearts and minds is tantamount to a battle for our country's tomorrow, for the future of socialism. Every party committee, every Communist directly bears responsibility for its outcome, for the practical accomplishment of all the tasks set for the great and complex undertaking of restructuring public education.

The decisions of the CPSU Central Committee February (1988) Plenum and M.S. Gorbachev's speech at the plenum are of general party relevance, because they have extensively and convincingly disclosed the essence of restructuring in ideological work, its turn toward man, toward man's consciousness and needs.

Restructuring has stirred up the people, has stimulated their social activity. People are interested in problems concerning the economy, social development in the city and the countryside, the conservation of historical and cultural monuments, improvements in ecological conditions, in everything involving their lives and the intellectual sphere. For this reason, it is now particularly important **to rely on the public, to "know the conscious opinion of the mass," and to use for guidance "what the people think and want." This is the way V.I. Lenin posed the question.**

Party committees are expected to analyze more profoundly the processes that are taking place, to respond effectively to events, to make suitable corrections in propaganda, and to exert an active influence on the shaping of public opinion. Unfortunately, at present serious lapses and occasionally even obvious miscalculations occur in this highly important field. After all, the frequent failure of administrative and economic organs to consult the public results in our material and moral losses.

An ill-considered decision was adopted, in particular, by Odessa Gorispolkom and its chairman, Comrade V.K. Simonenko, who, without appropriate explanation, ordered the reconstruction of Sea Boulevard, and thus brought about indignation and mass protests on the part of the population. The gorkom took great pains to calm people.

Practice shows that ill-considered publications may also occasionally mislead people. This happens when some authors, or sometimes even editors, overlook the complexity of the issues discussed, or when occasionally they simply lack a sense of responsibility. Is the article about V. Shakhray published in the newspaper RADYANSKA UKRAINA, an article that was silent about the political errors he committed in the period of shaping the Ukrainian SSR, not evidence of this? The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee evaluated this case in a political way.

Taking into account the particular features of the present time, what topics should receive particular attention?

Point one: This is the entire complex of problems concerning democratization, the intellectual renewal of the historical heritage, and the development of national culture. Life shows that greater account should be taken of the public interest in the so-called "blank spots" in history, in the traditions of the population, and in the particular features of individual regions.

Point two: The aforesaid topics include questions involving relations among nationalities, relations arising from the multinational composition of the republic's population, the need to intensify patriotic and internationalist education, and to more fully meet the interests of various ethnic groups.

Point three: It is to be borne in mind that the Ukraine holds, one may say, a particular place in the plans and acts of our ideological adversaries.

All this requires that we intensify ideological and political educational work, carry it out more purposefully and in a more offensive way, and ensure that it is differentiated and adjusted to individual cases. For this purpose, it is worthwhile to ponder the ways of organizing the profound examination of public opinion, and of raising the effectiveness of sociological research in the republic. Apparently, it is also expedient to set up a special subunit, under the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, to handle these issues. Every opportunity has to be used to study the moods, to explain party and government decisions, the decisions of party and administrative organs, and to strengthen direct contacts between leaders and people for this purpose.

In this context it is to be emphasized once again that **our party is definitely for glasnost, for democracy.** We will continue to rebuff in the most relentless manner those who suppress criticism, those who are unable or unwilling to see the need for a more profound restructuring. The ability to consult the public, to respect people's opinions, and to widely inform people is an important criterion of restructuring; and for the governing and managing organs, as well as for the mass media, it is a sign of political competence in their activity. The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo adopted the decision to further promote glasnost in party work. Emphasis was put on the need to inform the population about how the decisions are being implemented and, if they are not implemented, who is to blame for it, and what measures had been taken.

It is now also important to notice and to encourage everything that is new and useful, and to firmly combat everything that goes against restructuring to the detriment of socialism and the people. After all, restructuring is the revolution. A struggle is raging between new and old things. Under these conditions, **every communist is obligated to firmly defend and pursue the party line, and to strictly follow the fundamental directives set forth in the documents of the 27th CPSU Congress, in the report dedicated to the 70th anniversary of October, and in the decisions of the February (1988) CPSU Central Committee Plenum.**

One characteristic of the present stage of **radical economic reform,** V.V. Shcherbitskiy continued, is the large-scale campaign launched to promote new management methods on the basis of full economic accountability. Non-traditional production and economic formations are emerging. The cooperative movement and individual labor activity are growing stronger. A qualitatively new legal and economic situation is taking shape.

A general management scheme for the national economy is now being elaborated in the republic and in the country as a whole. It will be completed after having taken into account the remarks and suggestions made by deputies at the sessions of local soviets and the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet.

The general scheme envisages reducing the number of ministries and departments from 55 to 47, and cutting their central apparatus by 50 percent. At the oblast level, the number of administrative bodies will drop nearly 35 percent, and their apparatus will be cut 30 percent. At the rayon and city level, the administrative apparatus will be reduced 15 percent. In the republic as a whole we have to reduce the administrative apparatus by 93,000 persons, or more than 21 percent.

All this work has to be carried out in strict conformity with labor legislation and under conditions of glasnost. For this purpose, ministries and departments should form appropriated commissions, each chaired by the minister or his first deputy.

Shcherbitskiy then pointed out that, at the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee January (1988) Plenum, many leaders and collectives were strictly criticized for serious shortcomings and omissions in implementing the economic reform.

The results of the first quarter show that good marks were scored wherever appropriate conclusions were drawn from the criticism, wherever measures were worked out and taken to eliminate the bottlenecks and to raise the interest of labor collectives in the final results, and wherever cadre training was well organized.

Industry attained good rates in raising production (5.6 percent) and labor productivity (5.4 percent). In construction, the plans were fulfilled for utilizing capital investments, for construction and assembly works, and for commissioning fixed assets, houses, and facilities for social, cultural, and service purposes.

But these results might prove to be delusive. After all, to ensure the rates targeted under the 5-year plan for increasing industrial production, it is necessary to retain the average March daily volumes of production to the end of the current year. In construction, the annual program was only fulfilled 9-17 percent.

It must be admitted that the republic's party, administrative, and economic organs still have not succeeded in utilizing all reserves. Economic incentives still have not been made fully effective, and internal economic accountability and contracting, in particular, still have not been properly spread. Although the level of implementation of contracted deliveries rose and amounted to 99.2 percent of the total, the targets for goods deliveries to consumers were still missed by a value of R267 million. Many enterprises that are fully operating on the basis of economic accountability are falling short of the delivery targets; and in individual branches of the machine building and chemical industries the number of such enterprises amounts to 20 and more percent. Enterprises are failing to fill state orders for many important kinds of products, including consumer goods.

An analysis made by Central Committee departments shows that old attitudes, administrative pressure, and even petty surveillance are still prevalent in the management of enterprises and building organization, and there are breaches of the USSR Law on State Enterprises (Associations). The shortcomings noted must not be regarded as a mere tribute to the transitional period. To a significant extent, they can be explained by direct organizational failures in accomplishing the tasks set by the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee January (1988) Plenum. This must be remedied without delay. At this stage, it is important for all party and administrative organs, trade union and Komsomol organizations to purposefully enhance initiative, independence, and enterprise in the labor collectives and to spread advanced experience in economic reform.

More efforts should be made to deal with **ecological problems**. First of all, an effort should be made to make full use of significant capital allocations for the protection of nature. This has to be said because these allocations are regularly being left unused precisely in those oblasts in which the situation is the worst. This applies to Voroshilovgrad, Dnepropetrovsk, Donetsk, Poltava, and Cherkassy Oblasts. That is bad. It is essential to take these issues under state control and ensure the absolute fulfillment of the plans set for the 3 years and for the 5-year period as a whole. In this respect, a great deal can also be done by trade unions, the Komsomol, and our press. At the same time it is essential to recognize that the primary way to settle ecological problems is to create as soon as possible basically new, ecologically clean, reliable, and safe technologies that are capable of reducing material, power, and water consumption in production. Those who are expected to ensure this are the republic's scientists in cooperation with national economic specialists.

Having changed over to tasks involving **the agro-industrial complex**, the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary recalled that in his speech at the All-Union Congress of Collective Farmers M.S. Gorbachev criticized some oblasts and the leadership of the republic's agro-industrial complex as a whole for the failure to make full use of the chances available to augment food resources. Both in the Central Committee and in the Council of Ministers, he said, we all, and primarily Comrades I.A. Mozgovoy and Yu.A. Kolomiyets, must draw from this criticism appropriate conclusions.

As is known, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo has recently examined the progress made in the current 5-year period in stabilizing of the country's grain farming and in increasing grain and fodder resources. In the decision adopted on this subject the Politburo noted that the breakthrough necessary to increase the productivity of grain farming has not been made, and that the overall and per-hectare yields of grain were growing slowly. This also fully applies to a number of our oblasts which were responsible for the fact that the republic missed the 2-year targets for the delivery of grain to the state by 3 million tonnes. It was not the fault of weather alone. For example, the per-hectare yields in Nikolayev and Odessa Oblasts in 1987 only averaged 24.5 quintals. But every fifth farm harvested under the same difficult weather conditions 30 or more quintals. This means the main cause lay not in the weather, but in the attitude assumed by leaders and specialists of many kolkhozes, sovkhozes, rayon agro-industrial associations, oblast agro-industrial committees, and the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee itself to the matter at hand.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo has demanded that measures be taken to ensure the growing productivity and stability of grain farming, and to fulfill the plans for the production and procurement of grain in the current year and in the 5-year period as a whole. In the current year our republic's overall grain output should reach at least 51 million tonnes, and by the end of the 5-year period should be brought to 52-54 million tonnes. But in the immediate future the per-hectare grain yields are to be increased, as a minimum, to 35 quintals, or by 6-7 quintals compared with the average for the last 2 years.

The ways to accomplish these tasks were examined in detail at the republic-level seminar in Poltava, and of course there is no need to repeat what was said there. The only thing to be added is that for the time being the situation in the fields is better than last year. For this reason in the forest-steppe and the forest zones there are the conditions to ensure that the overall grain yield is at least as big as last year, and in the steppe zone, to fulfill the plan. This is precisely the point on which collectives should concentrate their efforts, organizational and political work. The speaker tackled the ways to raise the output of stockbreeding produce and to improve supplies to the population. The first-quarter plans for the procurement of stockbreeding produce were fulfilled. Compared with 1987, the procurements of milk rose 8 percent, and of eggs, 4 percent.

At the same time, compared with 1987, the purchases of meat dropped in 14 oblasts, and in the republic as a whole, by 16,000 tonnes, or 1 percent, although the plans were fulfilled. This resulted from the fact that the procurement plans adopted by many farms for the current year fell below the amounts of produce actually delivered last year. Rayon agro-industrial associations, agro-industrial committees, and planning organs were unable to convince kolkhozes and sovkhozes that this approach to the matter was wrong because it resulted in shrinking market stocks.

This is why in January 1988 the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo accepted the measures worked out in the field to improve meat and milk supplies to the population through increasing the targeted procurements to state stocks by 160,000 tonnes of meat, 900,000 tonnes of milk, and 800 million eggs. However, in a number of oblasts these measures are being taken in an obviously unsatisfactory way. In Kirovograd Oblast the sales of animals and poultry sank nearly by one-fourth, and in Voroshilovgrad, Nikolayev, and Odessa Oblasts, by 10-11 percent. In Kharkov and Kherson Oblasts milk procurements have remained at the 1987 level, while in Dnepropetrovsk Oblast they have even sunk. Notwithstanding the improved feed provision, at many farms of the aforesaid and other oblasts livestock productivity has fallen.

Naturally enough, all this had to affect supplies to the population. The market stocks of meat products have significantly shrunk in Odessa, Kirovograd, Nikolayev, and Cherkassy Oblasts, and those of milk, in Dnepropetrovsk, Zaporozhye, Odessa, and some other oblasts.

It is high time for all to realize, V.V. Shcherbitskiy emphasized, that this situation must not continue any longer. Full responsibility for the supplies of the population has now be laid on local organs. Precisely these organs are expected first of all to make maximal use of the potential available to rapidly increase production, to employ economic methods, and to more fully apply in practice all possibilities of leasing, of family, and other kinds of contracting. The congress of kolkhoz farmers discussed the work results of Anna Pelekh's family in Voroshilovgrad Oblast. It is essential to more widely familiarize people with this experience, and mainly to more vigorously translate it into reality.

In the country and in the republic, integrating processes in the countryside are growing stronger, combines, firms, association, and systems are being established to significantly raise production effectiveness. This work has to be invigorated. A great deal depends now on rayon agro-industrial association councils which have been set up in all rayons of the republic and are called upon to apply in an enterprising way new economic forms of production and labor organization.

Very inadequate use has been made of the possibilities of consumer societies to improve supplies to the population. The Ukrainian SSR Union of Consumers Societies (under Comrade S.V. Litvinenko) is incurring serious shortcomings in procurements, in stepping up one's own production, in trade services for the rural population, and in the activity of kolkhoz markets. In short, we must literally revive consumer societies, must revive them on a truly democratic basis.

The speaker briefly touched upon a task as important as the **housing problem.** In this field, he said, our plans are being strongly corroborated by practical deeds. According to our estimates, in 3 years we will put into service 10 million square meters of housing space in excess of the targets set under the 5-year plan. This will enable 200,000 families to hasten their housewarming parties. The plans are also being overfulfilled for commissioning children's and medical establishments, general education, vocational, and technical schools, and other facilities for social, cultural, and service purposes.

Nonetheless, the rate at which social tasks are accomplished on the whole cannot be regarded as satisfactory. After all, in 1987 we missed the targets for utilizing state and cooperative allocations for housing construction alone by R200 million. Well, people should be told who is to blame for this and why.

The situation in the **production of goods and provision of services to the population is also highly disturbing.** The situation is improving slowly. Sixteen oblasts are falling short of the targets set under the program for goods and services. In Dnepropetrovsk Oblast (with Comrade V.I. Ivashko as obkom first secretary), Donetsk Oblast (with Comrade V.G. Kucherenko as oblispolkom chairman), and Cherkassy Oblast (with Comrade I.K. Lutak as obkom first secretary) the arrears are the largest.

The availability of payable services is increasing very slowly. But after all, there is a lot of evidence that, if one sets about the business properly, the results can be good. Evidence of this is the experience of Norilsk Gorkom and the management of the Norilsk ore mining and metallurgical combine, experience that has been approved by the CPSU Central Committee. Examples of good work are also available in our republic, particularly in Kramatorsk, Severodonetsk, and in Tulchinskiy Rayon, Vinnitsa Oblast. The tasks set to meet people's needs for high-quality consumer goods and services were discussed at the recent conference with obkom secretaries.

The plans mapped out are difficult but feasible. The thing to do now is to put them into practice.

It is no secret to anyone that the shortage of goods in terms of the required assortment and quality is also accountable for the failure to fulfill the plan for retail commodity turnover. Consequently, there is a lack of balance between the population's perconal earnings and expenditures, and there are delays in the payment of wages. In connection with this there are legitimate complaints on the part of the working people. Time is short. Comrades who bear responsibility for this matter in the Central Committee and the Council of Ministers, above all Comrades Ye.V. Kachalovskiy, S.I. Gurenko, G.V. Dzis, V.P. Fokin, and ministers, must be more efficient and energetic in accomplishing these vitally important tasks. Social questions affect the interests of all people without exception, and it is essential to find ways of speeding up the process of finding the most complete and effective solutions. This is one of the most important demands of restructuring.

As we can see, V.V. Shcherbitskiy said at the end, no matter what sector we consider, there is a lot of intense work in store for us everywhere. We will cope with it if every communist, every laborer is deeply imbued with the feeling of personal responsibility for the destiny of restructuring.

It goes without saying that the main burden is to be borne by basic party organizations. In the wake of the accountability reports rendered by elective bodies, many of them have become significantly more efficient in their work, in playing the role of the political nucleus in the labor collective. However, as noted in the CPSU Central Committee decision on Kiev city party organization, many basic and shop party organization, as well as party groups still have not managed to achieve substantial changes for the better. This was also shown by the recent checks into the situation which we organized in Poltava, Lvov, and Rovno Oblast party organizations. Party committees must achieve a radical turn toward basic party organizations, must assist the latter, and must boost the latter's role and responsibility both in accomplishing socioeconomic tasks and in educating people.

Time passes quickly, and we are actually close to the **19th All-Union Party Conference which will be a highly important event in the life of the party and the country.** The progress made in implementing the 27th party congress decisions, as well as the results of the first half of the 5-year period are to be analyzed everywhere. The main thing is to think over actual restructuring experience thoroughly and take it to the conference, to show how restructuring concepts are being implemented in practice, what the results of restructuring are, what has already been done and what is still to be done. In doing this, it is necessary to find out specifically who is slow in restructuring and why, and to eliminate the causes of this slowness.

In the republic, there are many labor collectives, advanced workers, and innovators who have assumed big pledges, who are working persistently and productively, and who will achieve their goals without any doubt. It is essential to examine once again what will be the concrete results taken to the conference by every oblast, city, rayon, by every enterprise, kolkhoz, and cooperative organization.

To give a worthy welcome to the 19th All-Union Party Conference is an important duty of party, administrative, trade union, Komsomol organizations, and of all labor collectives. This precisely will be our practical contribution to restructuring, to accelerating the socioeconomic development of the republic and of the entire country.

CPSU Adopts Decision on Party Membership

PM211007 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Apr 88 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report under the rubric "At the CPSU Central Committee": "On the Results of Admission to the CPSU in 1987"]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee noted that over the past year 585,000 people were admitted to the party and party organizations were further strengthened organizationally and politically. There are currently 19,468,786 CPSU members and candidate members. The new recruits to the party are primarily workers, with kolkhoz members and all strata of the intelligentsia being widely represented. Party organizations have stepped up their attention to selecting for the party along with front-ranking young people cadre workers who have good experience of life and have proved their worth in concrete deeds during the revolutionary transformations taking place in the country.

The CPSU Central Committee recognized the fundamental importance of bringing greater glasnost to the process of selecting new recruits for the party. Party organizations have started holding more frequent preliminary discussions of candidates at meetings and labor collectives. Demands on Communists to observe statutory demands have been stepped up. Party organizations are more resolutely ridding themselves of people who through their behavior compromise the lofty title of Communist.

At the same time the necessary positive changes in the practice of selecting party members have not taken place in many party organizations. This work is not always linked with the specific tasks of restructuring and the need to step up party influence in the most important areas of the struggle to implement the radical economic reform and ensure the democratization of social life. Proper attention is not paid to stepping up organizational and political work among nonparty people or to molding a reliable basis for boosting party ranks. Formal statistical approaches, the strict regulation of admission to the party, and the desire to link the resolution of these questions with promotion to leading work have not yet been overcome. A considerable proportion of the applications to join the party are examined at closed party meetings without consulting labor collectives, and the discussions are purely formal. Many party organizations do not call strictly to account those CPSU members who recommend unworthy people for party membership. In a number of instances the proper demands are not made of Komsomol committees on these questions.

Measures to improve the role of candidate membership or to step up Communists' ideological tempering have not been taken everywhere. Serious damage is done to the prestige of party organizations by cases of unprincipled attitudes to party members who fail to set an example in production and social life, permit apolitical attitudes, tolerate manifestations of ideological aridity, nationalist quirks, and cases of drunkenness, and behave incorrectly in their private lives.

A number of party organizations have recently relaxed attention to implementing the program directive on ensuring a leading place for representatives of the working class among new recruits to the party.

The CPSU Central Committee instructed union republic Central Committees, party kraykoms, obkoms, okruzhkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms, and the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate to comprehensively analyze the state of work with regard to party admissions and the education of Communists, to take measures to eradicate the shortcomings existing in this work, and to unswervingly observe the provisions of the Statutes and the principled directives of the 27th CPSU Congress on the questions of molding and ensuring the high combat capability of party ranks as a decisive condition for improving the vanguard role of the party and the success of the restructuring policy.

Party organizations, in solving questions linked with bringing new blood into the party, are obliged to proceed on the basis of the need to step up political influence on all aspects of Soviet society's life with a view to strengthening socialism, accelerating the country's socioeconomic development, and overcoming stagnation and social apathy—everything that hampers our progress.

A most important criterion for admission to the party should be people's attitudes to restructuring and their specific actions in the sector to which they are assigned. Party ranks should be replenished with more worthy and morally irreproachable people who are distinguished by political maturity and ideological conviction and have shown themselves to be true strugglers for renewal and implacable opponents of bureaucratism, parasitism, complacency, and any deviations from socialist principles.

The work to select new blood for the party should be conducted overtly, openly, with an eye to the future, and with consideration of the real need for new party forces. Preliminary discussions of the admission applications from CPSU candidate members shall take place at meetings of labor collectives, on the basis that this is the point of departure for selecting truly front-ranking and worthy people for the party. The practice of admission to the party "for advancement" shall be resolutely discontinued.

Party committees and primary party organizations have been instructed to fundamentally improve their work with candidate party members, involving them from the outset in active participation in party life. Particular stress should be laid on stepping up the ideological and moral tempering of the new members and all Communists, and on educating them in the traditions of Bolshevism. We should strive to ensure that all party members set an example of high discipline and a creative attitude to work, consistently observe the democratic principles and norms of our life, and are able to work under the conditions of deepening democracy and extensive glasnost.

Bearing in mind the fact that a decisive influence on the molding of Communists as political fighters is wielded by the atmosphere inside primary party organizations, we should work persistently to ensure that the atmosphere in each of them is typified by high ideological content, mutual exactingness, active support for everything new and front-ranking, intolerance of shortcomings, and strict observance of the principles of party comradeship and the equality of all party members before the CPSU Statutes. Party ranks should be resolutely cleansed of those who oppose restructuring and through their unworthy behavior, money-grubbing, lack of attention to people's needs, and suppression of criticism besmirch the lofty title of party member.

The CPSU Central Committee Secretariat has been instructed in preparing materials for the 19th all-union party conference to bear in mind the proposals on questions of improving the practice of shaping and enhancing the combat capability of party ranks—proposals put forward at party committee plenums and meetings of Communists to discuss the reports from leading party organs on the leadership of restructuring, and also in the press.

Central and local party newspaper and journal editorial bureaus, and the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting have been instructed to extensively publicize party organizations' work in strengthening party ranks. Particular attention should be devoted to generalizing experience and seeking new approaches to democratizing selection for the CPSU and to organizing work with young Communists.

Journalists Union Supports PRAVDA Article

LD202203 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2000 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] Helping the party in ideological provisioning of urgent problems of radical economic reform is the duty of every member of a creative organization. Such was the theme of yesterday's plenum of the board of the USSR Union of Journalists. Those taking part fully supported the assessments and conclusions in the PRAVDA editorial [redaktsionnaya] article: Principles of Perestroyka—Revolutionary Thinking and Action.

No 'Single Platform' Opposing Perestroyka Seen

PM201357 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 15, 10 Apr 88 p 13

[Interview under the general rubric "The Portrait of the Opponent of Perestroyka" with historian Eduard Klopov, philospher Igor Kon, and economist Gavriil Popov by Aleksey Flerovskiy and Vladimir Shevelev in reply to reader's letter headed "Do Conservatives Have Any Chance?"—first paragraph is reader's letter]

[Text] In your country there are people who are uncompromisingly against perestroyka. But my teacher of political philosophy maintains that it is impossible to learn about statements opposing perestroyka from Soviet newspapers. Can you disprove that? The answer to the question how far perestroyka and glasnost can go depends on whether or not you can. Martin Gendreau, Chemin du Foulon Sillery, Quebec, Canada.

MN invited historian Eduard Klopov, philosopher Igor Kon and economist Gvariil Popov to draft a reply to this letter. Let's try and create a "joint portrait" of the opponent of perestroyka. Who is he? What is he opposed to? What does he propose?

I. Kon: The opponents, I think, are heterogeneous, but perhaps our attention should be focused on those from the old political rather than administrative sphere. They were criticized less than others and are the least capable of perestroyka. Joined with this group is a number of comparatively young people educated in the period of stagnation, people who usually began their careers in the Komsomol administrative machinery: all that is happening today in the country is against what they have grown used to and disappoints them. This phenomenon is not new. In the 1950s-1960s I knew student groups which advanced slogans: "From dictatorship of bureaucracy to dictatorship of the proletariat." By "dictatorship of the proletariat" they meant the regime existing in the years of Stalin's rule. They believed that there was "good bureaucracy" at that time. It, supposedly, did not steal and was honest, and, therefore, the destruction of thousands upon thousands of people could be forgiven.

E. Klopov: I think we can't rule out the possibility that some workers, young or middle-aged, and highly-qualified, may be found among the opponents of perestroyka. Once I had occasion to read a letter written by one such worker, aged 40. He stated frankly that today's Soviet worker is semi-educated and, in his opinion, incapable of putting perestroyka into effect. Different management methods are needed, he maintained, those which were used earlier. After reading this letter I realized that we should not suppose that all opponents of perestroyka are "survivors" or, as one expression puts it, the opponents of socialism. What is strange about the current situation is that there are quite a few people who sincerely stand for perestroyka but who have only a vague idea about how it must be carried out and what must be done at their work place.

G. Popov: Many technicians, especially workers in the defence industry, are among those who oppose perestroyka. I think the defense industry personnel is still deeply confident that everything is in order in their branch and that no changes are needed in defense-related spheres of the economy. Hence the illusions among its staff that command-and-administer methods of management are effective.

MN: In short, there is great diversity of opinion. Under these circumstances is it possible to have a single platform of resistance to perestroyka? This question arises because one MN reader handed over to our editorial board an eight-page typewritten text which had been dropped into her letter-box. It was entitled "information for reflection". Signed "Ignatov's group" it may as well be called anonymous. It ended with the following words: "Each honest person must pass on this message to his or her fellow citizens overtly and covertly." "Information" given indicated that the text was an attempt to formulate the platform of resistance to perestroyka. Our society's programme of renewal is proclaimed here a "Socialist-Revolutionary" programme which will allegedly lead the country and the people "to economic disaster and social upheaval, and then to the country's enslavement by imperialist states."

E. Klopov: I think this document cannot be regarded as unique. Maybe other documents of this sort are being passed from hand to hand. It's only natural, perestroyka is a complex process, some people are indifferent to it, others are actively opposed and need to conceptualize their position. "Information for reflection" seems to be rather frank. In fact, the echo of such sentiments is sometimes published in the press at large. As for the "Ignatov group", in my opinion, they help us get a more clear idea about what some people are striving for, namely those whose anti-perestroyka positions are not so obvious.

MN: The authors of the anonymous letter propose as the only worthwhile alternative to perestroyka ("the Bolshevist alternative") "the establishment of a strong and effective state power capable of rallying the public to fulfil giant social programme, which our people can cope with very well."

I. Kon: Such views are found in the periodicals as well. True, in these you first have the preamble: we are for perestroyka, but.... But here we face clearly outlined principles, well known to us from the Stalin era.

G. Popov: This "alternative" reflects the general tendency of the opponents of perestroyka, as I see it, to stake everything on centralism. This is what we need, they say, and the main condition for this is our man at the top. The advocates of such a concept do not understand that centralization of power, with everything run from above, will inevitably lead to man's generation. [as published]

MN: Such problems do not worry the authors of "information" however. They make a set of charges against the policy of perestroyka, seeing in it only defects. One charge has it that "more than two years of twaddle about 'a strong social policy' have aggravated social inequality, caused a drop in most people's real incomes and sharpened nationalistic and chauvinistic tendencies." No facts are given to prove this accusation, it is just hurled out in a self-assured and categorical tone.

I. Kon: I think that here a premise is being taken as an end result. Perestroyka has just entered the stage of practical realization, so the results mainly lie ahead. But the authors of this text do not see it and attempt to attribute all the shortcomings that have accumulated over many decades to the new leadership and its policy. I am sure that they have no bad notions of the past.

MN: Denying perestroyka's efficiency, the "Ignatov Group" says that it was precisely centralism that "allowed our country to achieve, during the first five-year-plan periods, incredibly rapid rates of economic development, which proved the doubtless advantages of socialist over capitalist production."

G. Popov: They make the wrong assessment of our historical experience, possibly because we have not undertaken to explain properly what happened in the 1920s and 1930s.

E. Klopov: As a historian I know what was written and how "vigorous" economic growth in the 1930s was. The facts were distorted, nothing was said about the thousands of people who starved to death or who were killed in reprisals.... Even today people in our country know little about the methods used to ensure "incredibly rapid rates." In my opinion, "Information for reflection" proves convincingly that all this has to be discussed now, that more glasnost is needed. Without this, it will be easier for the "Ignatov group" and its sympathizers to win over supporters of their anti-perestroyka stand.

MN: The group's "message" is interesting, not just because of its content, but because it represents a concrete attempt to bring together, on a single platform, the forces opposing perestroyka.

G. Popov: I think that with time they will feel the danger of perestroyka, and they know they have to hurry. But the existence of a clearly formulated platforms of political opposition to perestroyka makes it necessary to consolidate more actively the forces that stand for perestroyka. Although I have no definite notion regarding form, one thing is clear: we have to make socialist pluralism our starting point. A great deal will depend on general activization of political life in the country, on the development of glasnost, including an open and systematized analysis of the views of the "Ignatov group," and similar statements.

MN: Thus, even the most cursory acquaintance with "Information for reflection" enables us to add a few more strokes to the portrait of the opponent of perestroyka, and to single out some of the ideological orientations. To sum up, the opponent likes everything that has so far proved its inconsistency and placed the country on the brink of a crisis, all which society today is trying to get rid of. We have before us a clear picture of a conservative who is trying to preserve the structure, ideology, fears and lies of the past. We should not exaggerate the danger of the opponent, or the fact that he fears light, and feels that he is now in a diminishing minority, or that each real achievement on the road of perestroyka works against him. But he should not be underestimated either. Perestroyka is a complex process which affects the interests of everyone, and not always without pain. The difficulty of the task is what makes the conservative opponent optimistic about drawing to his side dissatisfied or doubtful people. His ally is avantgardism, eager to cover at one leap distances which it usually takes years of hard work to cover. Hence the task for the immediate future: not only to admit the existence of opponents of perestroyka, but also to counteract them, in the ideological sphere first.

RSFSR Supreme Soviet Session Opens

PM201401 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 20 Apr 88 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed "Information Report on RSFSR Supreme Soviet Sessions"]

[Text] The 7th session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, 11th convocation, opened at 1000 hours on 19 April 1988 in the Great Kremlin Palace.

The deputies and guests at the session greeted Comrades V.I. Vorotnikov, L.N. Zaykov, V.P. Nikonov, N.N. Slyunkov, V.M. Chebrikov, A.N. Yakovlev, P.N. Demichev, G.P. Razumovskiy, N.V. Talyzin, A.P. Biryukova, and A.I. Lukyanov with tumultuous prolonged applause.

Deputy N.M. Gribachev, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, is chairing the session.

Deputies and guests stood in honor of the memory of deceased deputies P.N. Medvedev and Yu.A. Ovchinnikov.

The RSFSR Supreme Soviet heard a report by deputy L.I. Matveyev, deputy chairman of the Credentials Commission, on verifying the credentials of deputies elected since the sixth session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet to replace deputies who have left.

The RSFSR Supreme Soviet resolved to recognize the credentials of the following deputies: G.D. Arzhanov, N.I. Kondratenko, A.P. Guzhvin, V.M. Marchukov, M.A. Knyazyuk, V.I. Potapov, V.P. Gerasimov, A.G. Zelepukhin, N.A. Chernukhin, K.K. Shabarshin, V.K. Pogorelov, G.V. Krivyakov, V.I. Khudyayev, Yu.i. Zhiltsov, B.G. Kibirev, I.M. Voloshin, V.V. Litvinov, S.L. Serokurov, L.S. Shustko, A.I. Orlov, A.I. Kostyurin, I.A. Gabitov, N.V. Kalinin, K.K. Shomoyev, V.A. Silakov, and G.N. Dmitriyev.

The session agenda and order of work were unanimously approved.

The session agenda includes the following issues:

1. On changes to the composition of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

2. On the work of RSFSR soviet and economic organs to provide every family with an individual apartment or individual house by 2000 in line with the 27th CPSU Congress decisions.

3. On improving the management of the RSFSR nationa economy.

4. On the draft RSFSR Law on the Nationwide Discussion of Important Questions of State Life.

5. On the ratification of RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decrees.

After this deputies moved on to discussing the issues contained in the session agenda.

The RSFSR Supreme Soviet unanimously elected deputy K.K. Shomoyev from the Buryat ASSR deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. A.A. Badiyev was released from his duties as deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium in connection with his retirement.

O.I. Lobov, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, gave a report on the second item on the session agenda—on the work of RSFSR soviet and economic organs to provide every family with an individual apartment or individual house by 2000 in line with the 27th CPSU Congress decisions.

Deputy V.F. Gorulev, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Communal Housing and Municipal Economy Commission, presented the coreport of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet standing commissions.

After this the RSFSR Supreme Soviet moved on to discuss the report and coreport on the second item of the session agenda. The following deputies spoke during the discussion: P.I. Reznikov (Leninskiy electoral okrug, Kamchatka Oblast); I.D. Pisarev (Baumanskiy electoral okrug, Moscow); A.S. Dvornikova (Sovetskiy electoral okrug, Lipetsk Oblast); B.K. Chabdarov (Prokhladnenskiy electoral okrug, Kabardino-Balkar ASSR); T.M. Zakharova (Okhtinskiy electoral okrug, Leningrad); A.P. Firyulin (Proletarskiy electoral okrug, Tula Oblast); V.B. Pirogov (Solombalskiy electoral okrug, Arkhangelsk Oblast); and also A.N. Shchepetilnikov, USSR minister of construction in the southern regions of the USSR.

RSFSR Government Appointments Reported

PM210919 [Editorial Report] Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian on 13 April 1988 in its First Edition carries on page 2 two RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decrees—both signed by V. Orlov, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and S. Chistoplyasov, secretary of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and dated 11 April 1988—on the appointment of "Gennadiy Vasilyevich Kulik, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Gosagroprom, as an RSFSR minister," and on the appointment of "Petr Ivanovich Kurenkov as RSFSR minister of trade."

RSFSR Supreme Soviet Views Housing Program

LD191227 Moscow TASS in English 1131 GMT 19 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 19 TASS—The deputies of the Supreme Soviet (parliament) of the Russian Federation, the biggest Soviet Union Republic have started discussing in the Kremlin today the program for ensuring separate well-appointed departments or detached cottages for more than 8.5 million families by the end of this century. The large-scale housing construction program was proclaimed by the 27th congress of the CPSU in February 1986. It is now one of the key elements of the perestroyka policy directed at considerably increasing attention to the social programs.

The session was addressed by Oleg Lobov, vice-chairman of the Council of Ministers of the republic. He recalled that the Russian Federation's housing stock is to be increased by almost a third to reach 3,000 million square meters by the year 2000. A successful implementation of these plans has been started. Since the beginning of the five-year plan period (1986-1990) more than 138 million square metres of housing, or 11 million up on the target figure have been built. Now there are on an average 15.4 square meters of housing per every member of a family.

Nevertheless, Oleg Lobov noted, the problem remains an acute one on the whole. Behind that average indicator there is a considerable difference in the conditions. Thus, for example, this figure is not more than 11-13 square meters in the areas of large-scale industrial construction in Siberia and the Far East. Behind that is the stereotyped mentality of some managers of industrial enterprises: First comes production, and social services come later.

An important part of the program is housing construction in the countryside where 1.8 million houses are to be put up and the housing problem is to be resolved by the year 1995.

Now the program of housing construction has been specified for each region, territory and the autonomous republic of the Russian Federation.

Chernobyl Area Reported 'Fully Stabilized'

LD201609 Moscow TASS in English 1535 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April TASS—The situation at the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Station and in the surrounding area has been fully stabilized following the April 1986 reactor explosion there, Yuriy Semyonov, a deputy chairman of the government commission for dealing with the consequences of the accident, told a news conference here today.

He said radiation levels throughout the station's territory are under one roentgen an hour and radioactivity near the emtombed 4th reactor crippled by the explosion is ten times as low as allowed by international norms for nuclear power generating operations.

After effective decontamination measures, the three other generating sets have been put back on stream. The personnel manning the station is exposed to radiation which is within international medical norms adopted for nuclear power stations.

Speaking of the medical aspects of the accident, Lev Buldakov, a deputy director of the Soviet Health Ministry's biophysics institute, told reporters that the health of people in areas around Chernobyl is being carefully monitored.

"Theoretical studies have shown, for example, that the incidence of cancer following the Chernobyl tragedy can increase by one-hundredths of one percent as compared with natural levels," he said. "But it won't evidently be possible to detect such a small deviation either statistically or epidemiologically."

"We are witnessing today a decline in the overall rate of diseases in these areas," Buldakov continued.

"This is due to the fact that people have begun to observe the rules of hygiene more strictly. The incidence of gastrointestinal diseases and the child mortality rate have dropped," he said.

Answering questions from newsmen, Academician Nikolay Ponomarev-Stepnoi said effective clean-up measures have been taken everywhere in the 30-kilometer zone around the Chernobyl nuclear power station are now practically safe for people as a result.

Further decontamination operations are irrational as they will cost very much, while being unable to cause any significant further falloff in the already low radiation levels.

Efforts To Combat Chernobyl Rumors Detailed

PM201317 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 12 Apr 88 p 8

[Own correspondent O. Gusev report "Chernobyl: The Third Spring After the Explosion"]

[Text] Kiev, April 1988, Chernobyl AES, No 4 Unit—A new subdivision has recently been set up in Chernobyl whose task is no less important than the duties of representatives of hundreds of other professions engaged in eliminating the consequences of the disaster: Its workers provide day-to-day information to the public about what is happening at the Chernobyl AES and around it.

Along countless channels, from telephone to video, information about the situation is pouring out and—no less important—calm, scientifically substantiated rebuttals are issued to all kinds of fabrications put about by our enemies, who from time to time succeed in alarming the most gullible of people, even throwing some of them into a panic.

...A rumor is a rumor. The more improbable it is, the more likely it is to be accepted unquestioningly. However, this one was probably more horrific than most: It claimed that the "sarcophagus" entombing the Chernobyl AES unit that exploded had split open and through the gaping hole radiation was pouring out in all directions, including the direction of Kiev. The powerful cranes towering above the encasement, it claimed, were patent evidence that all was not well with the entombment....

The fabrication, which spread through Kiev like wildfire, urged citizens to firmly close their windows and to stay at home from the holiday onward. It was the eve of 8 March, three nonworking days lay ahead, and during these days telephones never stopped ringing not only in Kiev but also in the apartments of acquaintances in other cities: "Have you heard what is happening in Chernobyl?"

Relating, not without a certain amount of amusement, the latest cock-and-bull story in the "Chernobyl Saga"—as reports of this kind have been dubbed by the people—my interlocutor, Aleksandr Pavlovkch Kovalenko, formerly a Chernobyl AES deputy director and currently chief of one of the latest subdivisions in the USSR Ministry of Nuclear Power Generation—the information and international relations section of the "Kombinat" production association—suddenly grew serious:

"By the way, there is one correct detail in the story about the allegedly gaping Chernobyl 'sarcophagus': The arms of cranes towering above it are indeed visible, but they have been there since shortly after the accident, that is, 1986. But clearly, the author of this 'information meant as food for thought' had not been to the site of the accident since that memorable April. And recently, seeing the cranes above the entombed unit for the first time, he 'set his tongue wagging' in amazement, and people likely to fall for this kind of story immediately pricked up their ears. That set the ball rolling, not only in our cities and villages but even across our borders.... If you would like to know more about the present state of the 'sarcophagus,'" my interlocutor said, "I could arrange a meeting with V. Komarov, acting chief engineer of the 'Kombinat' production association. Meanwhile, would you excuse me, there's an international call...."

Let me just say that my meeting with the candidate of sciences and "sarcophagus" specialist took place toward the end of my first day in Chernobyl and you can read about his views at the end of my report, but in the meantime I have to digress from my account of the interview in view of another, but in the opinion of the questioner calling from abroad equally sensitive, "little question": "What was it that exploded at your station today?"

The caller from Sweden was so convinced that he was right that, ignoring the reply of the head of the section to the effect that "nothing exploded" he went on with even greater insistence: "Well, if not at your station then tell me where else in the Soviet Union has there been an accident at a nuclear power station? And don't deny it, please," the person from Stockholm, who, it later emerged, knew A. Kovalenko personally from previous visits to Chernobyl AES, persisted, "we have just received a reliable warning transmitted automatically to all West European countries about a nuclear incident somewhere in the center of the European Continent...."

A. Kovalenko promised his Swedish interlocutor to look into it and some time later he was able to inform him what he had found out: A computer operator in Vienna had mistakenly typed in the code of a "nuclear alert" which automatically warns partners about an incident at any nuclear power station located on the European Continent. On this occasion too, the potential sensation burst like a soap bubble, but the number of telephone calls on the "hot line" in A. Kovalenko's section rose sharply.

Don't be suprised, he said, I receive more telephone calls from Italy and even Japan on this line than from Kiev, although the number is widely known: 52805.

The Kiev artist V. Buynovskiy also knows this number well. As a joke, he is "collecting" the various rumors current among his friends and acquaintances. But every time he nonetheless demands a serious denial in A. Kovalenko's section. The response is always helpful because people understand how important such information is not only for the masters of the brush and easel, but also the representatives of other creative unions, organizations, and departments whose duty it is not only to keep their finger on the pulse of their awe-inspiring neighbor, the Chernobyl AES, but also to contribute as much as possible to ensuring that the pulse of their compatriots does not race, among other things due to cock-and-bull stories in the notorious "Chernobyl Saga." Unfortunately, the provision of accurate information not directly related to operational matters leaves something to be desired. It seems that some officials and organizations are in no hurry to draw serious conclusions from the lessons of the past.

For instance, how many questions were addressed to the Chernobyl AES and Ukrainian republic organizations during the first two springs after the explosion and even now about the prevailing level of radiation in Kiev? These questions, however, remain unanswered to this day, which to some extent also contributes to the spread of cock-and-bull stories about Chernobyl. Why not, for instance, put out a report on the radio or in the newspapers that at the beginning of April 1988, for example, the level of radiation in Kiev was only double the normal background radiation and does not represent any threat to people's health.

...On one occasion the section headed by A. Kovalenko turned to N. Okhmakevich, chairman of the Ukrainian Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, with a request for assistance in organizing a television linkup with foreign interlocutors in order to swiftly publicize the latest information concerning the real situation at Chernobyl AES and fully rebutting the fabrications of foreign "voices." However, the head of the Ukrainian Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting refused, pleading...lack of technical facilities. And here is another example: The section proposed to the management of the Polytechnical Museum (Moscow) to organize a lecture on the current state of the No 4 Unit and the "entombment" project, as the "sarcophagus" is referred to here. This was rejected with the explanation that permission would have to be obtained from on high.

There is no denying that delays of this kind, unwillingness to assume responsibility, and a desire to sidestep acute questions, as during the period of stagnation, are causing serious moral damage.

Rereading this paragraph reminded me of a relatively recent event, dating back to July 1987—the trial at the Chernobyl cultural center of the direct culprits behind the accident at the AES. And of the attitude to the journalists gathered there, foreign journalists and ours. While the foreigners, in addition to being given a "direct line," were authorized to film, make sound recordings, and photograph and were provided with materials relating to the final session, our journalists, and I as correspondent of SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in particular, were told: "The Soviet press is not entitled to these materials."

As a result, reports on the trial in Chernobyl were broadcast by foreign "voices" within hours of the end of the trial, whereas they appeared in the country's central newspapers only several days later, in an abridged TASS version.

You might think that something like that could practically not happen now 9 months after the trial. You could not be more wrong! The section headed by A. Kovalenko recently prepared a bulky manuscript "Chernobyl: Events and Lessons" for the Political Literature Publishing House (Moscow). The people who assessed the manuscript approved it and indicated the need for the prompt publication of this book much needed by both our and the foreign readership. The Political Literature Publishing House also expressed itself in favor of this book and concluded a contract for its publication in...1989. The reasons? It is difficult to find editors, paper, and so on and so forth. One would like to ask the respected publishers: Why not, for once, give priority to the interests of the readership? After all, some of our more agile foreign partners are already besieging the All-Union Copyright Agency with requests to let them have the manuscript as soon as possible for immediate publication in a number of countries simultaneously. We must give A. Kovalenko his due, he and his coauthors did not succumb to the lure of the foreigners' promises. But it is possible to understand their indignation. According to specialists, this is a matter which brooks no delay, yet the foot-dragging continues. Allow me, with the permission of the authors, to cite just one of the answers to the questions contained in the as yet unpublished book:

"Is the 'sarcophagus' hermetically sealed or are there vents?"

"The 'sarcophagus' is not completely sealed in order to aid air-cooling of the buried mass. After the completion of the construction of the 'sarcophagus,' the damaged power unit ceased to be a source of heightened aerosol activity. Now the average daily emission of radioactive fission products is ten times lower than at normally operating units. No new patches of radioactive pollution or any increase in the overall pollution of the territory has been observed on the territory surrounding the Chernobyl AES and the city of Pripyat. The reduction in the intensity of gamma radiation accords with theoretical estimates...."

It is a good thing that information of vital interest to people today is not kept under seven seals at the section. A review "Chernobyl: Two Years after the Accident" has just been published. Its authors, A. Kovalenko, the section chief, and engineer A. Karasyuk, devote more than 20 pages to answering questions received from Soviet and foreign citizens and representatives of the mass media in letters, during personal encounters, and via the "hot line." An accurate, objective account is given of the elimination of the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl AES and the status of the situation to date. In short, the situation is as follows: Everything at the station is resuming a "permanent" status, as they describe it here, efforts continue to complete staffing so that the AES can operate without the duty-tour system, which is coming to an end. Many of the people who worked under this system are currently moving to new houses in the power workers' city of Slavutich built some 50 km from the Chernobyl AES. Incidentally Ye. Kravchenko, deputy chairman of the "Znaniye" Society, replied to the section's proposal to publish this review in a larger edition in Kiev: "There is no provision for this in our plan."

The aforementioned acting chief engineer of the "Kombinat" production association, V. Komarov, dwelt in greater detail on the situation at the AES and around it: "Since early May 1986 no reactions presenting a threat to the population or the environment have taken place in the entombed No 4 Unit, nor could they have taken place. Even in the unlikely event of the collapse of the walls or the roof of the 'sarcophagus,' radioactive dust could only endanger the personnel working there. But that is completely ruled out. The state of health of the hundreds of people working in the premises of the No 4 Unit entombed in the 'sarcophagus,' like that of all the other workers of the station is being constantly monitored by medical staff. The radiation level on the territory of the station has been reduced to a minimum and does not present a threat to health now."

...On my journey from Chernobyl I wrote in my notebook what, in comparison with previous visits to the AES, which took place in early May 1986, the fall before last when the "sarcophagus" was completed, and last year, was no longer to be seen there. First, there were no armored, lead-plated vehicles in the streets and near the station. There is no longer any need for them. The "rust-colored wood" near the AES is no longer there. Having been severely damaged in the accident, it had to be buried. There is no chaotic transport, or haphazardly put up structures or tents. In short, there is more order and efficiency. Above Pripyat, Chernobyl, Slavutich—which is the youngest city in Kiev Oblast—and other population settlements in the 30-kilometer zone and beyond, you can see storks settling comfortably on their nests. I am being absolutely truthful if I say that we returned to Kiev in a more cheerful mood than when we left for Chernobyl that morning. I must say that the trip did not just reassure me, but the whole crew traveling in our car, driven alternately by militia officers L. Pavlyuk and O. Shamraychuk, who have quite some reputation for courage. They were among the first enlisted in the struggle for the survival of the AES back in May 1986 and they are working in the special zone to this day....

New Nuclear Power Station Construction Planned

LD201942 Moscow TASS in English 1713 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 20 TASS—The construction of a new type of nuclear power stations with high-temperature reactors and helium cooling is planned in the USSR for the early 90s. The deputy minister of atomic power of the USSR Aleksandr Lapshin said this at a press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists today.

The reactors are meant not only for the generation of electricity but also for communal and industrial heat supply. Many countries show interest in cooperation with the USSR in the construction of new types of nuclear power stations, Lapshin said. Talks with FRG firms concerning joint construction of a high-temperature reactor are, specifically, underway.

Lapshin said the development of international cooperation in the area of nuclear power was stimulated by the accident at the Chernobyl NPS in April 1986. For instance, the convention on assistance in the case of a nuclear accident and radiological emergency was concluded. Some 70 countries have joined the convention by now. The USSR was the first to supply to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) a list of services it can render in an emergency.

Touching upon the question of the impact of the Chernobyl accident on the development of atomic energetics in the USSR, deputy chairman of the governmental commission for the elimination of the consequences of the accident Yuriy Semyonov said that the USSR will continue developing its nucear power, since the European part of the country has insufficient reserves of natural fuel. While the total capacity of 40 Soviet reactors makes up 28 million kilowatts, generation of electricity at Soviet nuclear power stations will double by 1990 and will treble in another five years. "Humanity is now on the road of restructuring its energy system, which is still based on natural fuel," he said. "There are estimates that such fuel will be enough till the middle of the next century, but nuclear, thermonuclear and solar energetics are indispensable in future. Even now many countries find it difficult to meet their energy needs without sped-up construction of nuclear power stations."

Yuriy Semyonov emphasized that after the Chernobyl accident close attention was given to enhancing the reliability of reactors and upgrading qualifications of the nuclear stations' personnel.

Economic Leaders Flout Environmental Legislation

PM201055 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Apr 88 Morning Edition p 2

[Article by G. Likhachev, Maritime Kray Prosecutor, under the rubric "Problems and Opinions" "The Law Has Not Been Written for Economic Leaders Who Forget About Environmental Protection"]

[Text] Vladivostok—An accident at the tailings dump dam of the Yaroslavl Mining and Enrichment Combine happened on New Year's Eve. The unexpected landslide wiped out the work of surveyors, planners, and construction workers and jeopardized the handing over of the start-up complex which incorporated the dam. But an acceptance commission was already in operation at the combine. The sector headquarters resolved to commission the complex at all costs. Maritime Kray received a telegram from V. Durasov, USSR minister of nonferrous metallurgy: The environmental protection installation should be dropped from the start-up complex. The kray Prosecutor's Office did not agree with the minister's decision, cautioned all the members of the acceptance commission, and informed the party kraykom.

Maybe this case is exceptional at a time when the whole of society is facing up to ecological problems? Unfortunately no: For our kray this is nothing out of the ordinary.

Some 40 percent of the waters discharged into the Zaliv Petra Velikogo by hundreds of enterprises is unpurified waste. Attempts are made again and again to commission production capacities when the environmental protection installations are still unfinished. For example, in October last year we discovered that Nakhodka was preparing to commission the second phase of a meat combine ahead of schedule. Specialists and Prosecutor's Office officials established that the local purification units were not ready for use. But the state commission headed by a senior official of the RSFSR Gosagroprom initiated the acceptance procedure nevertheless. The members of the commission had to be cautioned. The combine could not be commissioned ahead of schedule to the detriment of the environment. But by the end of the year, when everything had been completed, the project was accepted as really ready for operation.

A recent session of the USSR Council of Ministers Presidium Commission for Environmental Protection and the Rational Use of Natural Resources rightly criticized the USSR Ministry of the Fish Industry. In our kray only some units of its processing enterprises have their own refinery installations. But the ministry makes no attempt to ensure that even newly commissioned projects have ecological protection facilities. Even in the long-term program to develop the fishing industry in Maritime Kray, which has been approved by Minister N. Kotlyar, the section on environmental protection construction has been omitted.

Environmental protection is now one of the priority areas of the work done by our public Prosecutor's Office. We have established a special Prosecutor's Office concerned solely with the complex interrelationships between man and the environment and observance of environmental protection legislation. We have a plan of joint actions with the military and transport prosecutor's offices and with monitoring organizations.

But the results of all this effort still leave much to be desired. The balance of relations with local organs of authority and departments is still not in favor of the environment, despite the fact that there are more than 20 environmental protection monitoring organizations in the kray: "Primorrybvod," a territorial administration for hydrometeorology and environmental monitoring, and so forth. A solid army of nature supporters. Its efforts lack coordination, however. What is more, on more than one occasion state inspectors have signed acts to commission start-up projects when purification installations are either not ready or completely absent. Incidentally, even if they do not sign, officials a little higher up have always been found who will put their signature to clearly illegal documents.

I will give you a typical case. When the third start-up complex of purification installations at the "Pavlovskiy-2" Coal Pit was commissioned, V. Sukachev, chief of the Maritime Kray Basin Territorial Administration for Regulating the Use and Protection of Waters, turned a blind eye to the fact that the project was clearly unfinished. He removed senior engineer R. Osadchaya—who had taken up a principled position—from participation in the work of the acceptance commission and authorized the illegal act with his own hand. This leader was dismissed on the strength of our representation. Other officials of the administration with a tendency for "forgery" were also penalized. However, "skirmishes" of this kind far from always end up with a victory for justice. For example, there is an instruction issued by the USSR Council of Ministers on 28 June 1985 which authorizes timber rafting along only three of the rivers in Maritime Kray—the Bikin, Orekhovka, and Malinovka. But, in breach of this decision and the water code, the "Primorsklesprom" Association has floated timber along eight rivers, five of which are salmon rivers. The Prosecutor's Office protested this harmful practice. The chief of the association's timber rafting department and the chief engineers of two timber procurement establishments were dismissed and the general director was cautioned. It seemed as if the sensible approach had triumphed and the spawning grounds saved.

So what was our amazement when the general director, resorting to a flanking maneuver with the aid of his own ministry, produced a resolution approved by the RSFSR Council of Ministers 2 years after the instruction issued by the USSR Council of Ministers. In this document the list of authorized rivers in the Maritime Kray had been increased to eight. What a transformation!

You can understand the interest of ministries and local authorities in increasing production output as swiftly as possible. But attempts to do this at any price cannot be justified. All the more so as we are already well aware how great the cost of short-term ambitions and departmental and local bias ultimately proves to be. As we can see, the inertia of the one-sided view of the Far East merely as a province of resources is still strong. Consequently there is no end to the people ready to counter the movement of prized fish in a protected river by riding roughshod over rules and morality. There are an increasing number of examples of high-handed adminstrative methods prevailing over the rule of law.

The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers recently approved a resolution to radically restructure environmental protection in our country. It contains strict criteria of action that are binding upon everyone—from the worker to the minister. A USSR State Committee for Environmental Control has been formed. Nevertheless, the minister approved the document on acceptance of the start-up complex of the Yaroslavl Mining and Enrichment Combine without the protective dam. As if the resolution did not exist. As if the law had not been written for him.

Foreign Ministry Collegium Membership Reported

WA18070083 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 12, 19-25 Mar 88 p 6

[Item under the rubric "The Reader Inquires"—boldface as published]

In 1987 ARGUMENTY I FAKTY wrote about the perestroyka of Soviet diplomacy and about the expansion of glasnost in the work of the USSR Foreign Ministry. What new concrete steps have been taken lately? [signed] R. Sedlova, Kiev

As the VESTNIK MINISTERSTVA INOSTRANNYKH DEL SSR reports, work to firmly establish the principles of democratization and glasnost in the activity of the Soviet diplomatic apparatus is continuing in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Collegium of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs plays a most important role in the activity of the ministry. Beginning this year, the VESTNIK MINISTERSTVA INOSTRANNYKH DEL SSSR will regularly publish information about the more important questions raised in the collegium and about its work.

The VESTNIK MINISTERSTVA INOSTRANNYKH DEL SSSR reports that among the members of the collegium are: E.A. Shevardnadze, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR minister of foreign affairs; first deputy ministers Yu.M. Vorontsov and A.G. Kovalev; deputy ministers A.L. Adamishin, A.A. Bessmertnykh, L.F. Ilichev, V.G. Komplektov, V.P. Loginov, V.M. Nikiforov, V.F. Petrovskiy, I.A. Rogachev, B.N. Chaplin; RSFSR Minister of Foreign Affairs V.M. Vinogradov; and also several chiefs of administrations and departments and heads of other USSR Foreign Ministry subdivisions.

As a rule, collegium sessions are held twice a month. Urgent problems connected with carrying out the foreign policy course of the CPSU and the Soviet state are considered, the basic directions of the development of international relations are analyzed, reports on the work of Soviet embassies and representations to international forums and negotiations are heard, and other questions of the ministry's activity are discussed.

Subdivisions of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs central apparatus and Soviet institutions abroad are required to fufill resolutions of the collegium.

Packed Meeting Hears 'Kulak' Agronomist's Ideas

PM210815 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 13 Apr 88 p 2

[Special correspondents B. Konovalov and A. Konstantinov report: "Good Name Restored"]

[Text] Leningrad—Until just 1 year ago, only a few people in the country knew who A.V. Chayanov was. And even if they did know, they knew of him as the "ideologist of Russian kulaks." It was only last summer that Aleksandr Vasilyevich Chayanov, outstanding Russian economist, theoretician of the cooperative movement, writer, and art critic, was rehabilitated together with a group of other scientists. He was rehabilitated posthumously.

Material in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA and other publications about this remarkable man and his extremely rich theoretical legacy prompted a warm response from readers. Especially since the ideas generated by the constellation of agrarian scientists in the twenties have proved to be in close harmony with the changes now under way in the country.

People wish to know more about that time, about the life and work of those deleted from our history.

A discussion soiree devoted to A.V. Chayanov's theoretical legacy was held at the initiative of Leningrad's Cinematography Workers' Center, at which the creative intelligentsia from the city on the Neva met journalists and writers from KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA. The auditorium was full to overflowing. It even became necessary to install equipment in the foyer so that those who could find no room inside could listen.

Most of the questions were, naturally, addressed to the scientist's son, Candidate of Economic Sciences V.A. Chayanov. Writer and historian V.N. Balyazin and "Lenfilm" Movie Director S.A. Shuster also took part in the meeting.

Veterans Attack Bestuzhov-Lada Article

PM201129 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Apr 88 Second Edition p 2

["Letter to the Editors" from war and labor veterans Doctor of Economic Sciences S. Grigoryan; Doctor of Historical Sciences P. Golub; I. Gaglov; Doctor of Historical Sciences N. Makarov; and Candidate of Historical Sciences V. Makhalov: "So Far From the Truth..."]

[Text] NEDELYA (No 5 for February 1988) published I. Bestuzhev-Lada's article "The Truth and Nothing But the Truth" with a subtitle which specified the subject matter: "Reflections of a Sociologist on Tragic Pages in Our History and on Opponents of Restructuring." [The I. Bestuzhev-Lada article in NEDELYA was published in the 17 February Soviet Union DAILY REPORT under the headline "Stalin Crimes Stemmed From 'Hunger For Power'," pp 71-77] Those "reflections" could not fail to arouse feelings of bewilderment in us war and labor veterans (and, we are sure, in many people of our generation). Just think: Millions of people who unstintingly built the socialist motherland and defended it against fascist enslavement are described in that article as "fervent enemies of the renewal of society"!

First of all, we would like to ask the author: By what right and on what grounds does he undertake to convince the public that many, many war and labor veterans vindicate Stalin's personality cult and its tragic consequences? Can a serious scientist (and this is precisely how the weekly introduces him to its readers) really draw such responsible (but essentially irresponsible) conclusions on the views and the stand of people of the older generation with regard to such a cardinal issue as restructuring merely on the basis of individual comments sent to the editors following the publication of Ye. Yevtushenko's poem "Stalin's Heirs"? Bestuzhev-Lada peremptorily declares in his article: "For various reasons too many of those 'now living' definitely would not want the shroud of mystery to fall from Stalin's personality and for him to appear before the people in all his unsightliness." Just what is this if not a slander on an entire generation?

The overwhelming majority of war and labor veterans are working with their characteristic energy at the restructuring front in the name of the motherland to which they have given and are giving everything they can. They greeted with pride and gratitude the words which M.S. Gorbachev proclaimed at the festivities in honor of Great October's 70th anniversary: "Millions of Great Patriotic War veterans are still in commission today and are taking a combat-style part in the affairs of revolutionary restructuring and society's renewal." But Bestuzhev-Lada calls us "fervent enemies" and "opponents of restructuring."

Whether or not it was what the author wanted, he has tried to denigrate a generation of people who selflessly built socialism and defended it in the fighting against fascism and to present it to young people as a conservative force opposed to changes in the country. You can almost hear the author's satisfaction when he states and repeats that that generation is "diminishing year by year" and "is on the decrease." You really blush for the scientist when you read such expositions. They can only be called blasphemous. It is in vain that the sociologist tries to "obscure" his position with such reverences to the older generations as "We bow down to the ground before you." We can see that this is nothing more than a tactic.

The article is entitled "The Truth and Nothing But the Truth." But the "truth" which the author offers to readers is nothing but a half-truth. We veterans wholly share the assessment which the party Central Committee made of Stalin's personality and see both Stalin's unquestionable contribution to the struggle for socialism and to the defense of its gains and the gross political mistakes and the arbitrary rule perpetrated by him and his entourage, for which our people paid a great price and which had grave consequences for the life of Soviet society. And let Bestuzhev-Lada not adjure us: "And how will you appear in the eyes of your descendants?" Honest and only honest before history!

We also cannot overlook the arguments about the Combat Red Banner, which the author identifies with the name of Stalin. For every Soviet person the Red Banner was and still is the symbol of loyalty to the motherland and the oath. With it the front-line soldiers went into battle, with it the soldiers in the rear spent their days and nights forging our army's might, with it our people became the victor. And the words which I. Bestuzhev-Lada addresses to those who fought the enemy beneath this banner sound essentially mocking: "They are not interested in the flag's material, what it covers, or what the pole was used for. A banner is a banner, otherwise it turns out: With whose name then did they go into battle?!" If he, a scientist, does not know this, we will have to remind him—our generation went into battle with the motherland's name. All Combat Banners bore the inscription: "For Our Soviet Motherland!" And it is in vain that the author tries to foist on us philistine—to put it mildly—ideas.

In conclusion we would like to say the following. The opinion has already repeatedly and quite rightly been expressed that the development of democracy rules out anarchy and total license. Our public and the mass media rightly castigate everything that hinders restructuring and deforms the renewal of life. And this is widely supported by Soviet people, including "people of pension age, with their natural annual decrease," as Bestuzhev-Lada calls us veterans. But there are also deformations of another kind, when the sacred principles of our system are flouted, the entire people's gains—the object of their pride—are canceled out, a wedge is driven between the generations, the history of the party and the country is thoughtlessly blackened, and so forth. Such sallies harm the cause of restructuring no less than bureaucratism and everything that resists the country's renewal. And this should also be spoken of at the top of our voices.

TV Panel Discusses Stalin 'Crimes, Mistakes'

LD181512 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1600 GMT 17 Apr 88

["We Are Learning Democracy" program, presented by Fedor Mikhaylovich Burlatskiy, political observer of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, with Professor Lyudmila Panteleyevna Buyeva, Doctor of Philosophy, and Professor Oleg Petrovich Temushkin, Doctor of Jurisprudence]

[Text] [Burlatskiy] We have gathered together here today in order to discuss the article published in PRAVDA. You probably know about it; it is called "Principles of Restructuring—Revolutionary Nature of Thinking and Acting." The article itself was a response to an article published in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA on 13 March this year, which was called "I Cannot Waive Principles." As you can see, both the articles concern principles, the principles which are dear to all of us, and the principles on which we stand and which we want our country to develop. Well, the first question that arises: Why has this article in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA just appeared? It is an attempt, if you like, to consolidate the forces which are opposed to restructuring, or perhaps rather, not simply against restructuring, but against revolutionary transformation of our society, against deep-going structural reforms. And it is probably to do with this that there was such a sharp reaction, not just on the part of PRAVDA and not just on the part of other press organs, but from the whole of our society.

So here is the first question that I would like to discuss. The question is posed in the article "I Cannot Waive Principles." It is the question of the attitude to Stalin. In fact, it seems to me that the question is not put properly in this article. It is said there that it is now a basic issue, to determine Stalin's place and his role in our history. I think that the answer to that question has already been given, at the time of the 20th party congress. We know about the central party decision on the personality cult which was adopted in 1956; we stand on the ground of that decision up to this day, and we are developing our ideas about this, on the basis of fresh facts. The main issue concerns the question of the legacy of Stalin, of the system of administration that we now call the command-administrative system.

[Buyeva] Fedor Mikhaylovich, in fact I belong to the generation that has experienced all these processes for itself, from fanatical raptures concerning the Stalin's personality to the extreme stage, or degree, so to speak, of disappointment. There have been both ups and downs, both faith and doubts, but all the same, in our generation there remain far more of those who are convinced and dedicated to principles, and so I am for principles, as well. The question only concerns what principles we are talking about. Of course, Stalin's personality and the assessment of his role in history requres a detailed examination of all the objective and subjective moments, on the basis of documents and facts, so that there should be no personal agitating or whatever because little is known of some facts while a great deal is known about other facts. But the point here is that Stalin's personality itself has already become a kind of symbol, a certain model for a certain understanding of socialism, concerning what values and what principles we invest in this socialism and which ones we, in fact, fight for.

[Burlatskiy] Indeed, there remain certain illusions among the broad masses concerning Stalin. Many do not thus far understand everything that is happening at the moment. One of the reasons, in my view, is the fact that for 20 years people have not received any information about this. Very few of us have actually read Khrushchev's report to the 20th party congress. Personally, I think that this report should have been published. It is only recently that a fresh wave of serious and objective investigation, a fresh wave of informing public opinion about what has happened, has begun. And probably one of the important tasks is connected precisely with providing answers to the questions that the public, and first and foremost young people, are asking, because there exists mistrust, there exists a failure to understand, and this mistrust, this failure to understand, are in fact exploited in Andreyeva's article.

[Temushkin] Well, to begin with I have just a few words about Andreyeva's article. Paradoxical as it may sound, I am, in general, glad that it appeared. The appearance of this article has, as it were, really opened up the true picture and has shown that there are still very, very many people in our society who are principled opponents of restructuring. And it is now, in advance of the 19th party conference, that these people have shown who they are.

[Burlatskiy] If we can return to the prejudices which are alive among the masses and among the young people, a proportion of young people, who are badly informed, what (?they say) is: In point of fact, Stalin himself dealt with his own comrades-in-arms. He, so to speak, used his own methods to fight bureaucracy, he put this bureaucracy under fire and at the same time took control over it. And with regard to the workers and the peasantry, democratic principles remained intact here and hence there was widespread enthusiasm, the enthusiasm of socialist construction.

[Temushkin] Fedor Mikhaylovich, well, you know, you have put a very good question, and I will straight away turn to the example of the plenum of the USSR Supreme Court which was held literally the other day, at which—take note—Stalin died in 1953, and people have started to be rehabilitated since 1954. And there is still no sign of an end to this rehabilitation. This points to just how many thousands upon thousands of innocent victims fell during those years. And, of course, it is not just a matter of those who at some time or somewhere did not agree with him. He crushed into this iron mangle everyone who got in his way. Here is a specific example. At its last plenum, the USSR Supreme Court examined a protest by the USSR procurator general about the case of Ivan Demur. Who was this Ivan Demur? At the time he was repressed—that was in 1938—he was 24. He had come from a simple peasant family. He worked as an ordinary loader at a timber depot in the Far East somewhere, where, as we know, every physically healthy person is worth his weight in gold, just as everywhere in the country. Well, Demur was accused of agreeing to participate in a counterrevolutionary organization—a terrorist, subversive—I am not at all exaggerating, that's how it was written—subversive, terrorist, saboteur, with the purpose, so to speak, when the time came, to take part in an armed struggle against the Soviet state.

[Burlatskiy] But why did they grab him?

[Temushkin] Well, I'll tell you in a moment whecy he was grabbed. First I'll get to the end and then I'll explain how this man's fate ended. I had the file in my hands, it had five or six pages, including the examination record which took up a page and a half, the record in the name of an accused person, where he pleads guilty to all these grave crimes. True, there is one ludicrous question in it. Asked where he hid his weapon, he replied that he couldn't find the place right now, he had forgotten where he had hidden it. Well, those examination records probably did exist, those where he did not plead guilty, but they were not filed. But what happens next? This case—it was investigated in the Far East, in the town of Blagoveshchensk—is passed on for examination to, where do you think? The Military Collegium of the USSR Supreme Court. It didn't take the Military Collegium of the USSR Supreme Court, headed by General Nikichenko, long to come to Blagoveshchensk and hold a trial which was held on the basis of the well-known decision of the Executive Committee on 5 December 1934, when all the democratic guarantees were excluded from our criminal proceedings, the examination of a case without the participation of the sides, presentation of the indictment 24 hours before the start of the trial, and the sentence of the death penalty—and the general sentence was not made the subject of an appeal—but the death sentence was subjected to immediate execution. And so—I draw attention to what was written down—the trial began at 1500. The trial ended at 1515. This whole case was examined in 15 minutes. The sentence, on one page—and what huge letters they were, we remember how they simply filled the page—found guilty, sentence to death; and that same day Demur was shot.

You asked the question why this was necessary. This was necessary because at that time the trial of Bukharin Rykov was going on in Moscow—of this so-called right-Trotskiy grouping who were accused of creating a network, a rebel network—and this had to be confirmed. But how could this be confirmed? They had detained people like (Demur), Ivanov, Petrov, Sidorov.

So the attitude to Stalin in this respect was quite a simple one. I would like to add a couple of words if you will allow me. It was quite a simple one. When people say that in his time there was law and order—you will forgive me for what is perhaps a very bold thing to say—yes, there was order—in the cemeteries. We can do without that sort of order.

[Buyeva] It was an order based on violence and on attack.

[Temuskhin] We don't need that sort of order, an order based on violence is not order.

[Burlatskiy] Oleg Petrovich, since you have already been talking about this, there is one thing which is often not very clear to me. Why did the repressions of the thirties reach such a scale? For example, the annihilation of officers in the Army—generals, marshals, right down to company commanders? What was the purpose behind this, was it something (?personal) from the point of view of strengthening Stalin's power? Or was it, as some believe, Stalin's paranoia? For this was on the eve of the war, not long before the war. Everybody could already see the threat of fascism—and such wholesale slaughter of military cadres—how do you see all this?

[Temushkin] I see all this as follows. Of course, Stalin was not without intuition; of course he was not without intelligence. And, of course, he could not fail to realize that, in saying that he, so to speak, was heading the building of socialism, he was building not socialism, but some quite different social system. He could not fail to realize that. Nor could he fail to realize that, of course, healthy forces among the people—and there were many of them—first and foremost comrades-in-arms of Lenin's, but it was not without purpose that the first and most terrible blows, the most fateful blows were inflicted precisely against Lenin's comrades-in-arms. We recall the delegates of the 17th congress, the Congress of the Victors, 70 percent of whom were subsequently repressed, just as quickly.

[Burlatskiy] That was the voting at the congress. About a third of the congress delegates voted against it, and of course (?he) had plenty to spare, well, it was two thirds. It seems to me that the repressions in the Army were connected with the fact that Stalin was expecting a plot all the time. He thought that such repressions, such a regime, could not fail to bring forth a protest, an organized protest. But he was wrong. There was no plot. He was doing it with the future in mind, he was doing it so as to have a colossal reserve of strength of personal power.

[Buyeva] Fedor Mikhaylovich, [words indistinct] (?dwell a little while) on what Stalin thought, what he supposed socialism should be like. We don't know everything about this, in fact. And if one is to judge simply by his real actions, by his actual deeds, then we can say with some conviction that this was not the socialism that Lenin conceived of, not even the theoretical model. But whether Stalin was a victim of self-deception, whether he believed that he was actually building socialism, and that one could through such harsh methods of violence and repression introduce socialism, the most humane system, that is probably something for the psychologists to puzzle out, because what I read about the personality of Stalin, for example, is all very unconvincing and has virtually no documentary evidence [sentence as heard]. But one thing does surprise me, that, let's say, in this... I can understand that in order to create a regime of personal power, in order to assert an unquestioning, so to speak, system of subordination, of having any orders coming from above carried out without reflection, that there has to be some great strength for this. There is no greater force—apart from the strength of conviction in socialism—what was working was truly the force of terror. And another thing I would like to say is that the stereotype about Stalin directing the repressions against bribe-takers, extortioners, against bureaucrats, against jumped-up officials, and about him being benevolent to the people, in my opinion, this is very great hypocrisy, because the repressions which in fact affected the peasantry, and the processes which swept the country in 1937, judging by the documentation, they embraced the secretaries of raykoms, rank-and-file workers in the raykoms, they embraced team-leaders, simple kolkozniks, ordinary people.

Burlatskiy] Well, did Stalin believe in socialism, or not? Some people even talk about a counterrevolutionary coup having taken place on the threshold of the thirties, and from then on there having been no question of socialism. Personally, I think the problem is more complex, more complex. And the argument in favor of a more complex examination of the problem is a very simple one—after all, this has happened not just in our country. If we return to the history of our party and of our country, we shall see that right from the start we had two tendencies, two traditions, two views of socialism in contention. The first, which found its embodiment in war communism—war communism, of course, was largely the result of the civil war and its difficulties, but to a large extent, war communism was the product of the illusion of a leap into communist society, a quick leap into communist society, bypassing the socialist stage, an illusion which was backed up by the hopes for a world revolution. And the second (?experience) is the New Economic Policy. Stalin always belonged to that first tendency. If we take his works—("?The Question of Leninism"), or even his last work, "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR," he was always returning again and again to the idea of a leap into communism. Even in his last work before his death, he wrote we would soon arrive at simple exchange of products, that money would be abolished, and so on and so forth. A certain policy was behind these illusions, the policy of destroying normal economic relations, including commodity-money relations, the transfer of kolkhozes to sovkhozes, the absorption of kolkhozes by the state, if you like, strict state control of all spheres of life, including the cultural sphere. In other words, I would say that it is not simply Stalin's crimes, it is his mistakes as well. As it happens, what we have to deal with most of all at the moment is these mistakes, which became part and parcel of the command-administrative system. We have come up against a problem which Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev spoke of strongly and sharply in Tashkent recently. I would like to quote this, because it seems to me this is the key to the understanding both of the present situation in restructuring and of the discussion that has heated up now in our press, not just around the article in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, but around the problems, the real problems, of our development.

We have realized, Mikhail Sergeyevich said, that the party must display courage and will, and rid itself of the ideas about socialism that have come into being which bear the stamp of certain conditions, and particularly of the period of the cult of the personality; it must rid itself of old ideas about methods of construction; and most importantly, it must rid itself of everything that has, generally speaking, deformed socialism, and fettered the creative capabilities of the people. That, it seems to me, is the root of the problem facing our country, facing our theoretical thinking and our practice, and perhaps that is why it is being discussed so heatedly in the country at the moment.

[Buyeva] I think that we are learning democracy, and I think that we shall manage to learn it, but the fact is that this study has been really difficult for us. And in connection with this, I would like to draw attention to one idea expressed in Nina Andreyeva's article. She said, very sharply and emotionally, how long are we going to go on casting down our sacred objects and authorities, so to speak, that no society can in fact live without sacred objects and authorities, and so on. One can agree with that, that indeed there must be for us some sacred principles, which we should not take in vain, so to speak, in this context. But on the other hand, the question is, can we preserve not authorities, not sacred objects, but essentially idols as authorities? That is what happened with the figure of Stalin. There are very many people who say, well, maybe he did do a lot of bad things, but in the interests of the cause, we shall preserve him as a figure, as a symbol, as a symbol of our great victories—and indeed there were victories—and in this context the personality should not have all these flaws, ulcers, (?and so on) bared. I would not agree with this, because when we say, how are we to educate a generation, well, that is why it often does not trust the older generation, it is distrustful and feels a certain feeling of, perhaps, uncertainty, because this generation has too frequently made black into white and white into black.

[Burlatskiy] Political intrigues?

[Buyeva] Yes, that is, it has been too evasive in general in evaluating this or that event, this or that personality. And what is needed here really is honesty, courage, and definitiveness, and of course, the facts which are already known to researchers, known to the commission which is working on rehabilitation, these should be known to the broad masses, so that idols are not created in place of ideals, idols which are worshipped fanatically; this by no means creates order or enthusiasm, but it leads to very grave consequences, the destruction of a person's awareness.

[Temushkin] You know, Fedor Mikhaylovich, I would like to go back a little, because you spoke about Stalin's mistakes. It simply hurts my ears when what happened under Stalin is called mistakes. For example, can you call a mistake by Stalin—I am moving forwards—a mistake by Stalin, his conviction that Hitler would not attack us in June 1941? But he was convinced of this; he had evidently come to believe in himself so much by that time, believe in his, so to speak, irrefutable foresight, that he committed a very crude blunder. That was his mistake, but, that was his crime, because it cost our people inhuman sacrifices; and again, understanding very well that he was to blame for what he had done in the first instance, he destroyed the command of the

Western front, headed by General Pavlov, making the charge that the latter, through inefficiency—and to begin with the charge was formulated differently, that he was almost an agent of the Germans, that the front was opened up and that in that way the Germans got to Smolensk in a few days. [sentence as heard] So, let us call a spade a spade.

[Buyeva] Fedor Mikhaylovich, if we could recapitulate, we do not simply ascribe to the personality of Stalin his dramas, tragedies, farces, comedies, so to speak, his (?big) mistakes, errors and crimes—on its own, that too is a very interesting issue. But what is to be ascribed to Stalinism as a definite concept of socialist society, Stalinism as such, I think that such a concept, such a tendency, at the level of ideology and even at the psychological level does exist. What can we (?examine)? It is the methods using which socialism should be built. So perhaps all the ideas, the (?values were put into play)—we are building a society in which there should be liberty, equality, fraternity, public ownership, absence of exploitation—indeed, these fundamental, cardinal issues were (?inculcated in) the people, but how? Mainly through methods of violence and undemocratic methods, through methods of the command style, and public property in that event came out as property in its state form, and that is what makes up the economic lever, the economic force of bureaucracy.

I think that the opponents of restructuring understand very well that, for example, the law on economic reform has first and foremost to undermine the economic base of bureaucracy. You won't find it easy to (?deal with) bureaucracy through fine words, glasnost, discussion, and critical condemnation, but the economic roots of bureaucracy have always been located in the command style of management, in excessive centralisation, let us say, and in the fact that it has ruled over the use of public property, in essence, frequently without regard to the opinion of the people. I think that when we put forward slogans such as talking about more socialism, this also means more power must be given to the soviets, that is, there must be a democratization, and if it is restricted just to glasnost, then it is not yet full democratization. And here I agree with the opinion of our playwright Aleksandr Gelman—he recently had an article in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA—that so far it is still liberalization, but democratization, as a system which really does change the structure of power relationships and change the forms, methods, and style of management, that is a process which is connected with a different understanding of socialism. And moreover—this is my last recapitulation, the model of socialism which is connected with the Stalinist understanding, which also has some currency, which we have taught in textbooks, it does happen, and so on, it is an idea of socialism and of society, of a system which somehow brings sacrifice into full play—there is this ideal of sacrifice that there has always been, self-sacrifice in the name of, and so on. And that is something that we have to get to grips with very seriously, because there is a lot of speculation around this sacriciciality. Really, is there a need to sacrifice, for example, a personality and the dearest thing that it has, life, in the name of social wellbeing, (?of realization of) of a social (?ideal)? In a number of situations of historical development, such a need has arisen and it always may exist, and so on, but this places a huge responsibility on those who determine what this social wellbeing is, and whether it really is a historical necessity.

[Burlatskiy] Concerning Stalinism and our ideas of socialism, let me start with an example. Quite recently I spoke at a scientific meeting and I talked about China. I have been there and was able to observe the processes of economic reforms in that country. I talked about the agrarian reform which has been implemented there. Family contracting is at the foundations of that reform; and the 800 million Chinese population has transferred to family contracting, in a cooperative framework, in the framework of public ownership on the land. Roughly speaking, they have to sell one third of what they produce to the state for a good price, they consume one third themselves, and they sell one third in the market. This would ensure over a few years a colossal upsurge in agricultural production. It raised the peasants' living standard by more than one third. It grew threefold in 5-6 years. Well, of course, (?being used to) poverty, they are achieving only what is sufficient, but still, for nearly 1 billion people this is a colossal event.

Well, understandably, my colleague the professor says this is all correct, that they have, so to speak, achieved big results, that this is an effective form. But is this not a retreat from socialism, a use of capitalist methods? I say, look here, you say that the workers and the peasantry and the working intelligentsia have started to live better, so how can this be a retreat from principles? Rather it is all connected and has led to an increase in labor productivity. No, I say, if you begin with differentiation, someone will be richer, someone will be poorer. So he prefers a certain differentiation in sufficiency to equality in poverty.

[Buyeva] But this opinion also exists.

[Burlatskiy] Why? Because of course he has before his eyes the socialism of the thirties and fifties. So it is indeed very important to answer for oneself the question, what kind of socialism was this? Well, you could say rather schematically that it was Stalin's socialism. I'd put it this way, that it was a sort of universal state control. I'd even describe it as state socialism.

[Buyeva] Well, I would probably also perhaps....

[Burlatskiy] State socialism, as a form, when all property belongs to the state, and when not just industry-...[changes thought]...well, and in the countryside, too, property was to a considerable extent in the hands of the state, when culture too was under tough state control, and when all this was, moreover, based on the mechanism, the harsh mechanism, of mass repression. That's the heritage we're renouncing. That is the heritage we want to transform. We want to transform it, as a consequence of restructuring, qualitatively, as has been repeatedly stated in our party documents, into a qualitatively new society.

[Buyeva] Here a question arises...

[Burlatskiy, interrupting] Yes, and what sort of society is this? You've said a few words about it from the viewpoint of democracy. Well, I'd begin with economics. Yes. This is from my viewpoint, an economy that could be called a planned commodity economy, where state property gradually becomes genuinely public and the property of the whole nation. What does this mean? Pluralism of property: state property, cooperative property, property of public organizations, property of the family and household, individual property, which compete with each other, vie with each other. There's no need to be afraid of this word, socialist competition. Lenin believed in it. Because without such without the element of contest, forward development is impossible.

Of course, the main problem we have now, especially in the run-up to the 19th party conference—I'm entirely in agreement with you, and I share not only the enthusiasm and the orientation toward the content of Gelman's article on Soviet culture—is the problem of democracy. That's the problem. That is the vital issue, and it's not a simple issue. Under a one-party system we have to find some mechanisms, both traditional and nontraditional forms of democracy. Glasnost and freedom of expression are the traditional forms. These are the traditional forms, and we're using them now. We also need to find our own nontraditional forms: redistribution of powers, of the functions, if you like, of power, among forms: redistribution of authority, of functions, and also of power, if you like, among the various institutions of our system, primarily between the party and the state, between the local soviets, the public organizations and the labor collectives, in other words that, on its own level and in its own sector, any labor collective should be able to decide its own affairs.

[Buyeva] Now, we've touched on the question of the restructuring of, say, democratic forms of administration. But is this utopian, or is it some sort of real and, I'd even say, iron necessity? Is decentralization—let us put the question this way—up to a certain level and to a certain degree, is decentralization a weakening of our state, or, on the contrary, a strengthening of it? Judging by Nina Andreyeva's article, it would seem to be a weakening, as it were, of the state: that the more firmly we keep a hold of these, the stronger and more durable the state will be, and so forth. But I believe the contrary is true, because our society and our system, so to speak, by which the state is governed, has become an excessively complex system. And to limit ourselves to these incredibly centralized forms of administration means that we simply cannot reach a great many aspects.

[Burlatskiy] As to this question of what stimulates restructuring, in the West—at present I visit the West—they're writing about a crisis of socialism, of contemporary socialism generally, not just of our Soviet socialism. I'd say that there are, of course, crisis phenomena, but it's a crisis of state socialism which is about to be raised to a new level, to a new form it's a change of form. Capitalism too, incidentally, has not been standing still either. There was classical capitalism, state capitalism, state monopoly capitalism, and no one has yet found a definition for the capitalism that is now altering its forms and conditions and adapting to the new technological revolution. It's this technological revolution that has delivered its final verdict on that system. Indeed, it demanded the radical and revolutionary alteration of society. But the article in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in general tries to create the impression that we are in a state of crisis, that our society is in a state of crisis, and that in order to extricate ourselves from crisis, order must be introduced and there must be a return to Stalin.

[Temushkin] I would still have thought it necessary again to say a few words about who in particular it is at present that takes Stalin's name as a symbol. Just recently there was an excellent article in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA. It was called "Collectors and Militiamen." It told how militia workers in the Moscow Criminal Investigation Department tried to fabricate—I do not think I need use any other word—a case against people involved in collecting. I mean they tried to fabricate several notorious cases, so to speak. The author noted the interesting point, so to speak, that there was a huge portrait of Stalin hanging in the office of the investigator working on his case. Comrades, that is very significant. That is very typical.

These sorts of people still exist even now. People who want to return to those times are indeed lamenting those very opportunities for acting unlawfully which were possible in Stalin's time. I can simply cite only this example, maybe it is (?striking), but it should put us once again very seriously on our guard when we are resolving issues concerning the struggle against Stalinism.

Back in June-July 1941 the Judicial Collegium of the USSR Supreme Court did something unprecedented for those times. It pronounced a not guilty verdict on Mikhail Sergeyevich Kedrov. He was a comrade in arms of Lenin, a comrade in arms of Dzerzhinskiy, a former member of the Collegium of OGPU. He was arrested and, so to speak, illegally made answerable for various anti-Soviet activities. And then the the Soviet Union's Supreme Court, the Judicial Collegium, pronounced a not guilty verdict. What was Kedorv's fate subsequently? Kedrov was not released from custody, and on 18 October 1941, that is, 3 months later, he was shot on the personal instructions of Beria.

[Burlatskiy] That was the father of Academician Bonifatiy Mikhaylovich?

[Temushkin] Yes. Another 25 people were shot with Kedrov. Their cases were being investigated, but these investigations had not yet been completed. Among them were two party obkkom secretaries and a whole group of prominent military chiefs. Let me give you the names of these people now. They were Shtern, USSR Supreme Soviet deputy, a colonel general and commander of the country's anti-aircraft defenses; Lieutenant General Rychagov, commander of the country's Air Force and a Hero of the Soviet Union; deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet and candidate members of the Cpsu Central Committee Colonel General Loktionov, commander of special military districts in the baltic, and Lieutenent General Smushkyevich, legendary ace pilot and Twice Hero of the Soviet Union. Let us note that this took place on 18 October 1941 when the Germans stood at the gates of Moscow. How much all these people were missed at the front at that time!

There is something else which I have to say. When people today say that Stalin played a great role, so to speak, in our victory, I will not mention, so to speak, his will, his strength. Really, during that period of time there was a noticeable decline in repressions. There were virtually none. But what does that show? And what is more, some of those people who were held in custody—Rokosovskiy, Meretskov, a former chief of General Staff was given an army on this front; Rokossovskiy became a commander of the front. I could mention several other names: Petrovskiy, and incidentally one of Petrovskiy's sons [word indistinct] was shot, whereas the other was returned, so to speak, from prison colony, from prison camp, and immediately was given a command and subsequently died near Smolensk. So what does it show when the fate of Stalin himself was intertwined with that of the war? It turned out that maybe for the first time in the entire history of our state, his fate depended directly on the fate of the country, and so he understood that victory, that defeat would bring with it his own personal destruction and he changed his style. They say that he even began listening to certain commanders. In fact, he stopped the repression. But no sooner had the last salvo of the war died away than this terrible process continued, and literally in the next days and months after the end of the war mass repressions resumed.

[Buyeva] Oleg Petrovich, you have touched on a very important topic there. It is a theme to which increased importance is being attached on quite a broad scale in the public conscience, in our conversations, and in questions at lectures. That is the price of progress, so to speak. The price that the people have to pay for the implementation of one set of historic changes or another. I am talking about placing a value in the economic sense determining how human strengths and lives should be paid for. This question has come up repeatedly. This problem was also touched upon in the article by Nina Andreyeva as a principle. She writes thus: When students ask how it could it happen that thousands of hamlets in the non-Chernozem Zone and Siberia became deserted, I answer that this too is the high price of victory and postwar restoration. I categorically disagree with this because, first, that was not the price of victory from our non-Chernozem Zone, and it was not the price of restoration. That is falsification of history.

Second, in general, how can there be restoration at the expense of ruination? I simply cannot understand that. How could it happen? What sort of economic restoration is it that brought economic destruction, so to speak, and not only the economic destruction of certain forms of life in this non-Chernozem Zone but the undermining of the very foundations of the patriotism which is linked with attitude to the soil, the homeland, and all that?

[Burlatskiy] Well, it looks as if we have come to the end of our broadcast. This is the main problem of real reform, the guarantee of the irreversible nature of restructuring. The guarantee of the irreversible nature of restructuring lies in radical transformations in the democratic system and in radical transformations in the economic system.

[Buyeva] And in changing the people themselves.

[Burlatskiy] Not to mention the cultural system, that indeed is what I wanted to say. The main guarantee of restructuring lies in ensuring that the broadest masses become really involved in it. Of course, everything cannot be achieved by mere slogans alone and real changes are needed. When a worker or a peasant feels that he is gaining from this transformation, from this new way, be it team contracting, family contracting, or individual labor, he will say yes, I am all for restructuring, when a worker or a peasant feels increasingly that he is taking part in the process. You see, I recently visited the Ordzhonikidze works and I saw with my own eyes the labor collective soviet where the overwhelming majority of people are workers. They already feel that they are participants, that they are making decisions. This worker will say: I am for restructuring. It concerns not only the upper level. It concerns the foundations. It embraces the masses. And our business, the business of people who in one way or another are involved in theoretical research and propaganda, is to promote this with all their might.

Briefs

New Weekly

Nikolay Setunskiy is chief editor of the new weekly ECHO OF THE PLANET, published by TASS and the Soviet Journalists' Union. Setunskiy says that the magazine will carry on-the-spot reports from different parts of the world. TASS correspondents operate in 125 countries. There will also be stories by foreign journalists, public, and political figures. Apart from politics, the magazine will deal with problems of ecology, demography and the latest developments in science, technology, and culture. There will also be a feature where reporters express their own views on particular issues. There have already been some 2,000 subscription requests from abroad. [Summary] [*LD170052 Moscow World Service in English 0210 GMT 16 Apr 88*]

Economic

Dolgikh Urges Metal Consumption Reduction
PM210831 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 10 Apr 88 p 3

[TASS report under rubric "Securing Considerably Improved Efficiency in the Production and Use of Metal": "Resources Are the Foundation of the Economy"]

[Text] A conference was held in Moscow on 9 April to discuss resource-saving and the rational use of ferrous and nonferrous metals in the national economy. The leaders of ministries and departments, members of party, soviet, and trade union organs, enterprises, and organizations, and leading scientists and specialists took part in its work.

G.G. Vedernikov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, gave a report on progress made in implementing the comprehensive program to reduce the metals-intensiveness of the national income, "Metalloyemkost." S.V. Kolpakov, USSR minister of ferrous metallurgy; V.A. Durasov, USSR minister of nonferrous metallurgy; R.N. Arutyunov, USSR first deputy minister of heavy, power, and transport machine building; and A.V. Glovatskiy, USSR first deputy minister of the electrical equipment industry, presented information on measures being taken to step up work to improve the quality of metal production and economize on the use of metal. B.V. Kachura, secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee; Academician B.Ye. Paton; Ye.A. Brakov, general director of the ZIL Production Association; A.M. Korolev, team leader of machine operators at the "Uralmash" Production Association; and a number of other comrades took part in discussing the problem.

The conference was addressed by V.I. Dolgikh, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

One of the key, central issues facing the economy, it was emphasized at the conference, is to step up work to the utmost to save resources, particularly metal, as the most widely used production material, and to reduce the metals-intensiveness of the national income by a factor of two by the year 2000, as envisaged by the program. The work done so far in sectors of the national economy in this direction is producing some positive results. The output of progressive types of pipeline, rolled metal, and metal powders is being increased at a preferential rate and greater attention is now being paid to introducing low-waste technologies and improving designs. Industrial labor collectives in Chelyabinsk and Gorkiy Oblasts and the city of Minsk, and collectives under the USSR Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry and a number of others are implementing creative ideas which will ensure growth in production output without increasing the volume of metal used. Service centers for the pre-treatment of metal products are working successfully within the Ukrainian SSR Gossnab system. All this made it possible to save more than 4 million tonnes of metal products in the national economy in 1986-1987 against the 1985 level.

At the same time the scale and level of work to save and make rational use of metal products are extremely inadequate and do not meet the requirements of the task. Many ministries, enterprises, and organizations have still not made a sharp turn in the direction of metal-saving, continue to solve production tasks by increasing the amount of metal used, and tolerate failures to meet the targets set by the program. This mainly applies to enterprises and organizations in the automobile industry, machine tool building, and the agro-industrial complex. As a result, in 1987 the reduction in the metals-intensiveness of the national income was considerably lower than planned.

The attention of the leaders of ministries, departments, enterprises, and organizations has been drawn to the need to decisively change their attitude to the problem of reducing the metals-intensiveness of the national income. Daily work to make economical, rational use of metal products must be carried out with the support of the potential revealed by economic reform.

A very important organizational lever to satisfy the need for metal and ensure its rational use is to strengthen direct links between metal producing and metal consuming enterprises. The present system has shortcomings in this respect and provides scope for narrow consumer attitudes. Metallurgists, machine builders, and construction workers should put their heads together and jointly solve the problems of improving metallurgical production.

Serious criticism was addressed to the USSR Gosplan, USSR Gossnab, and USSR State Committee on Prices, which should be leading the work to evolve economic measures opening the way to efficient metal production and the output of lightweight machinery and structures. Planning organs and leading scientific institutions are urged to critically rethink their approach to the long-term planning of ferrous and nonferrous metal production and consumption. We must abandon the stereotyped ideas of extensive growth and direct quantitative relationships between volumes of raw materials and the end product and improve the scientific basis of forecasts.

It was recommended that local party and soviet organs step up their work to implement the resource-saving policy, develop political and organizational work at the local level and in labor collectives, and mobilize the party aktiv and all the public to implement the program to reduce the metals-intensiveness of the national income. Every working person must be made aware of the state importance of this task.

On the basis of the conference results, it is felt necessary to take additional measures in ministries and departments to improve the effectiveness of work connected with metal production and consumption.

Deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers I.S. Silayev and B.Ye. Shcherbina and the heads of CPSU Central Committee departments I.P. Yastrebov, A.G. Melnikov, V.S. Pasternak, and I.I. Skiba took part in the conference work.

Academicians Discuss Cooperatives Law Provisions

LD192139 Moscow TASS in English 2119 GMT 19 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 19 (TASS)—More than 20 amendments and clarifications were suggested by Soviet scientists to be introduced into the draft law of the USSR on cooperatives published last March. They discussed the draft law at a joint meeting of the bureau of the Department of Philosophy and Law and the Bureau of the Department of Economics of the USSR Academy of Sciences today.

President of the Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences, Academician Aleksandr Nikonov in his speech concentrated on aspects of the draft law that have a direct bearing on the interests of 26,000 collective economies—agrarian cooperatives, functioning in the USSR. He, specifically, suggested that state orders should not be placed with cooperatives which account for 47 percent of agricultural produce. Agricultural cooperatives should be able to decide independently what crops to grow and in what volumes, should be able to determine the priority areas of livestock breeding. The market and the demand of the market should become the main regulator of collective arm production, the scientist holds.

The matter is that the state law quite often engages the facilities of the economy, depriving it of the opportunity to get above-the-plan profit through marketing additional products at agreed upon prices. Such a state of affairs runs counter to the plans of switching all collective economies of the country to full cost accounting since next year [sentence as received]. At the same time, there could be state orders for state farms.

The participants in the meeting noted the contradictoriness of separate provisions of the draft law. They proposed the provisions stimulating the development of cooperative societies of architects, artists, engineers. It was said that there should be changes in the system of progressive taxation on cooperatives introduced as of April 1, 1988. More than 14,000 cooperatives employing 150 thousand now operate in the country. Economists, jurists and sociologists are of the opinion that new cooperatives should be exempt from taxation until they are able to pay their own way.

Economist Addresses Worries Over Price Hikes

PM200801 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Apr 88 Second Edition p 3

[Article by Doctor of Economic Sciences V.I. Shprygin, chief of Price Research Institute department, responding to readers' letters under the "Reader-Newspaper" rubric: "'Let's Talk About Prices'"—first paragraph is PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] "Let's Talk About Prices" was the headline given to answers published 8 February from A.N. Komin, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee on Prices, to PRAVDA readers' letters. As only to be expected, the topicality of the problem and the frankness of the discussion still further sharpened interest in problems of price formation and the principles of the upcoming reform. The editorial office received more than 500 responses whose authors vigorously carried on the discussion. We asked Doctor of Economic Sciences V.I. Shprygin, chief of a Price Research Institute department, to answer certain letters.

Let us begin with the letter from Yu. Askolskiy from the station of Tbilisskaya, Krasnodar Kray:

"I think it is premature to discuss price reform. Before discussing it people should be given economic training because a considerable proportion of the population simply has a poor understanding of price formation policy. Our daily discussions on this topic are at the present more reminiscent of gossip."

I cannot totally agree with this viewpoint. Indeed more attention must be devoted to economic training than has been hitherto: When economic restructuring takes place, its fate largely depends on the workers' economic competence. However, this certainly does not mean that price reform must not be discussed for fear that some people may not understand everything. It was previously the case that the population's opinion on this subject and often that of scientists as well was ignored and the actual price changes were, as a rule, merely explained by the prices committee as a fait accompli. As a result so many follies were committed in price formation that not merely a review but radical reform must now be carried out. Lack of glasnost gives rise to rumors, creates a hullabaloo around certain goods, and kindles unhealthy passions.

The reform of price formation is an exceptionally crucial and complex task. The normalization of the economic situation in the country and the fair resolution of questions of socioeconomic policy will decisively depend on how correctly it is carried out. However, not everything is sufficiently clear with regard to the implementation of the reform. Therefore, the discussion also acts as nationwide economic studies in which every piece of advice is indeed worth its weight in gold.

I would at the same time like to say that the upcoming reform of price formation must not be seen solely as a price hike. For the first time in many years the methods, structural principles, and the very philosophy of price formation are being radically reviewed. In this connection I cannot agree with the following opinion either:

"It is merely necessary to dispel the fog around prices. The law of price formation is simple and is as follows: The price of a commodity consists of production, transport, and trade expenditure plus the profit margin of the producer, transporter, and trader, plus the tax to the state from this profit margin. That's all. You can forget the other prices—wholesale, purchase, and so forth." (N. Kirillov, engineer, Magadan)

This idea of methods of structuring prices is still quite widespread. It served for a long time as a theoretical foundation for the "cost-based" principle of price formation. It was thought that this stimulates manufacturers to produce new output. The consequences were not slow to make themselves felt: They manifested themselves in continual price hikes and the establishment of producers' monopoly diktat over the market.

It should also be noted that all types of prices—wholesale, purchase, estimated, retail, and so on—serve definite spheres of economic activity: industry, agriculture, construction, and trade. The only important point is that they should all form an intrinsically united whole. Unfortunately, at present there is no such unified system and a multitude of separate types and groups of prices effectively exists, often conflicting with one another.

The letter from S. Grigoryev (Zagorsk) attracts attention:

"In my opinion, people whose ideal is low prices don't understand that if everything stays as it is, shortages in the country will steadily rise and life will be even more difficult. Low food prices do not stimulate food production—life has already proved this. By gobbling up subsidies we are gobbling up our country's future. I, an old man on a medium-sized pension, am prepared to waive my interests to extricate the country from stagnation."

Now I want to cite V. Valyayev's letter (Novyye Sanzhary, Poltava Oblast):

"Why were we so alarmed when we heard about the possible change in prices? Yet we still say that we are aware of the complexity of the situation in the economy... Are we really only 'scraping by'? Apartments are full of carpets, suites, and crystal. On the streets there are people wearing furs and driving 'Zhigulis.' They have rings on their fingers and gold earrings in their ears. When you go to a school locker room you find fur coats and hats. There are long lines outside liquor stores and you won't see ragamuffins there. Of course, there are also people who are hard up. But they have appeared because some people live excessively luxurious lives. That is why price reform is necessary."

However, I must honestly admit that most of the letter writers hold a different opinion.

"Who needs the kind of restructuring whereby there are price hikes on foodstuffs and goods in daily demand and more shortages? The way I see it is this: Restructuring means we must give the country lots of good-quality cheap output. Price hikes conflict with restructuring, which should be accompanied by price cuts" (A. Nasedkin, Bogdanovo village, Ramonskiy Rayon, Voronezh Oblast).

There is probably not a single person in our country who would not like to see prices decrease. Everyone wants this. But we must consider reality. Price hikes on a number of commodities are an enforced measure. This is by no means because people are going around in furs and own automobiles, gold earrings, rings, carpets, and crystal. We must also endeavor to provide the people with a good life. Changes are necessary because prices have been set for a long time without regard for economic laws.

A long-term policy of unduly low prices for many commodities has not only deformed national economic development but has also had an adverse effect on all socioeconomic policy. Many sectors have become unprofitable. State subsidies for them amount to R84 billion and may reach R104 billion by 1990, according to forecasts, including R80 billion for foodstuffs. The trouble is not only that subsidies have far exceeded all reasonable limits but also that they are not stimulating sectors' development and are not making it possible for them to switch to new conditions of economic activity. Take, for instance, the coal industry. Its losses are R5 billion, yet domestic coal prices are approximately half world market prices.

The policy of unduly low retail prices was one of the factors in the violation of remuneration according to labor and the appearance of leveling. It does not permit an objective solution of questions associated with assessing the population's living standard and rationally siting the country's productive forces. Unduly low retail prices are synonymous with waste.

Take the state of affairs regarding meat and milk. Because of low retail meat prices (R2 per kg) it is unprofitable to raise livestock on subsidiary plots, but at the same time it is a typical situation for kolkhoz members, after handing over to the state meat at R4 per kg, to buy 2 kg of meat in state stores with the money made. Dishonest people turn 1 kg of meat—through continual resale—into tonnes.

Nor can the question of the social injustice of existing retail prices be hushed up. It is well known that poorly paid strata of the population obtain no more than 15-20 kg of meat per capita per year, while the highly paid get 100 kg or more. This means that, given the state subsidy of R3 per kg, poorly paid workers receive a subsidy totaling R45-60, whereas highly paid workers receive a minimum of R300. Such redistributive relations in favor of the highly paid also exist for other commodities subsidized by the state. All this indicates the need for radical reform.

Many people are worried not so much by price hikes in themselves as by the measures linked with compensating the population for possible losses. Options for such compensation are being studied. Children's goods, medicines, and so on will remain socially protected by the state. By and large the population's minimum and average subsistence level will rise as a result of the implementation of a series of compensatory measures and measures to boost wages.

"Won't the result be that expensive goods will not be in demand and it will be necessary to close enterprises, which will lead to unemployment?" N. Tikhonov from Arkhangelsk asks in alarm.

Why, you may ask, produce goods which are not in demand? For a long time workers were paid wages for performing intermediate operations irrespective of the end result. It often turned out that there was no demand for their output and it had to be foisted on consumers. The more expensive the output, the easier it was for the enterprise to fulfill the plan. Now the situation is fundamentally changing and wages are paid for the end results from the enterprise's overall income received after the output has been sold. This compels it to produce output for which there is a demand rather than simply output which is more costly.

"You are feeding people promises: The market will be saturated and prices will drop. But, first, it is not profitable for enterprises to saturate the market, it is much easier to sell goods in short supply at inflated prices and, second, there is a simple mechanism for protecting the consumer against exorbitant prices. A system must be introduced whereby the longer an item remains unsold, the lower its price becomes. Price cuts must be made at the manufacturer's expense. It will be more advantageous to manufacture cheap, good-quality commodities, which will be bought more rapidly, than costly commodities for which the planned profit may not even be received" (N. Bakulik, joiner, Leningrad).

Contractual prices provide incentives for broadening the range of goods manufactured. But practice shows that, in conditions of a continuing manufacturers' monopoly, prices are often quite high. So the practice of fixing discounts and cutting the prices of goods at manufacturers' expense will be applied more widely, as the reader suggests, to protect purchasers' interests. Along with this it is envisaged that the prices of new output (both contractual and listed) must necessarily be cut per unit of consumer quality in comparison with the replaced output.

"The future price hike is alarming. I am not good at questions of economic theory, but I do know we are now living from one wage packet to the next. One wave of rumors follows another" (G. Kucherenko, Nikolayev).

For many years the democratic principle of collegiality in decisionmaking on price formation was supplanted by the principle of one-man management. Glasnost and the establishment of scientific principles of price formation are necessary to avoid repeating mistakes. Of course, economic policy cannot be determined by a referendum or by a simple majority. But indisputably the key to this reform's success is open, democratic resolution of questions of price formation.

Agricultural

Grain Farmers' Situation, 1988 Tasks Outlined

PM201403 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 13 Apr 88 p 1

[Editorial: "The Agricultural Workers' Main Task"]

[Text] The scope of spring field work is expanding in the country with every passing day. Machine operators in North Caucasus and the south of the Ukraine, the Central Chernozem and Lower Volga regions, Central Asia and Transcaucasia have brought the sowing machines out into the fields. In conditions of restructuring and a mass transition to economic methods of management, the task of the day is to carry out the sowing within the optimum deadlines and to a high standard, create a solid basis for the harvest of the 3d year of the 5-year plan, and greet the 19th party conference in a worthy fashion.

Among the many questions confronting agricultural workers this year there is the main one—gathering at least 235 million tonnes of grain. It is also necessary to create reliable preconditions for the fulfillment of the targets of the Food Program, for raising grain production to 260-280 million tonnes in the coming 5-year period. This is a complex and responsible task which calls for maximum efforts on the part of communists and all agro-industrial complex workers. The state needs a great deal of grain not just for consumption but also to increase livestock production. In this context one cannot forget to recall M.S. Gorbachev's words at the Fourth All-Union Collective Farmers Congress about the utilization of all resources to increase gross grain yields: "Without increasing grain production it is impossible to resolve the task of ensuring the country's self-sufficiency in feeds and reducing imports. We must grasp the simple truth that grain must be grown, not begged."

A certain amount of work is being done to resolve this most important problem. Thanks to the introduction of intensive techniques, scientific achievements, and progressive experience, it has proved possible during the past 2 years, despite difficult weather conditions, to increase grain crop yields by 3.3 quintals per hectare in comparison with the average annual level achieved during the 11th 5-Year Plan, and gross grain production by 30 million tonnes. Wherever grain production has really been treated as a priority and contract and economic accountability relations have been established, especially tangible results have been achieved. The Gastello Kolkhoz and the "Krasnaya Zvezda" Stud Farm in Minsk Oblast, "Zhovten" Kolkhoz in Kiev Oblast, the "Imeni Kominterna" and "Pamyat Lenina" Kolkhozes in Cherkassy Oblast, the "Ukraina" in Khmelnitskiy Oblast, and a number of other farms threshed 71-75 quintals of grain per hectare on fields cultivated by means of intensive techniques. The Zhdanov Kolkhoz in Chernovitsy Oblast achieved grain corn yields of up to 120 quintals on irrigated land. The kolkhoz named for the 22d Party Congress in Rostov Oblast's Tatsinskiy Rayon obtained 40 quintals of millet per hectare and the "Krasnyy Partizan" Kolkhoz in Volgograd Oblast's Mikhaylovskiy Rayon obtained 29 quintals of buckwheat per hectare. Around 1,000 of the country's farms have achieved yields of 50-60 quintals per hectare. The remarkable example set by pacesetters and innovators is convincing evidence of our agriculture's tremendous reserves.

However, the experience that has been accumulated is being put to poor use and as a result no noticeable breakthrough has been achieved in the development of the grain sector. During the first 2 years of the 5-year plan there was a shortfall of 21 million tonnes of grain and 47 republics, krays, and oblasts failed to fulfill the grain procurement plan. An alarming situation has arisen in the production and procurement of high-grade wheat, buckwheat, and pulses. Farms in Volgograd, Saratov, and Kurgan Oblasts and Bashkiria have allowed grain production to decrease. A situation where around 7,000 of the country's kolkhozes and sovkhozes obtain yields of only 8-9 quintals of grain per hectare cannot be regarded as normal. An increase of 10-12 million tonnes of grain could be achieved by overcoming their lag.

At a recent session, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo discussed the question "On the implementation of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers Resolution of 11 July 1986 'On measures to enhance the stability of the country's grain production and to increase grain and feed resources in the 12th 5-Year Plan.'" It was noted that the large annual shortfall in grain production not only hampers the further development of the production of livestock products and the improvement of supplies to the population of valuable food products, but also has an extremely negative effect on the country's economy. An analysis of the situation has revealed that in many republics, krays, oblasts, rayons, and farms the main cause of low returns on investments in the intensification of grain production—the neglect of economic, organizational, and educational work with machine operators, specialists, and other cadres—has not yet been eliminated. Instead of working out technological and organizational systems to guarantee increased yields on every field, people in many places confine themselves to merely organizing numerous meetings. Poor use is made of family, lease, and other types of contract. Crude violations of technological discipline are tolerated, intensification means are not applied comprehensively, and corners are cut. In a number of rayons in the Volga Region, the Urals, Siberia, and Kazakhstan work with fallow land is poor, the land is allowed to become overgrown with weeds, and little organic and phosphate fertilizer is applied. It is no accident that last year spring wheat on fields cultivated using intensive techniques produced yields of only 13.8 quintals per hectare in Kazakhstan, and only 9.4 quintals in Kuybyshev Oblast.

This shortcoming must be resolutely eliminated. This year cultivation by means of intensive techniques is to be introduced on 50 million hectares, including 39 million hectares of grain crops. To ensure that each of them produces the highest possible yield, it is necessary to allocate the fields to teams of skilled machine operators and specialists capable of skillfully carrying out the sowing and carefully tending the crops in accordance with the biological stages of their development. Unfortunately, people willing to take on this work have not yet been found for all the fields to be cultivated by means of intensive techniques. On many kolkhozes and sovkhozes a basic order in working the land has not yet been established and there are violations of technological discipline. This has been allowed to happen on a number of farms in Kherson, Nikolayev, and Crimea Oblasts in the course of the current sowing season, where cultivators and sowing machinery which not tuned in advance were taken out into the fields. The result is a poor standard of sowing work and a witting reduction of the harvest. Party committees are called upon to make a strict assessment of all instances of substandard work and to raise the responsibility of farm managers, specialists, and machine operators—the people who work directly in the fields—for the high standard of the execution of every technological operation and the achievement of the best possible end results.

Winter crops are a major source of grain. However, inadequate use is made of their potential. Because of crude violations of agricultural techniques, thinning, undersowing, and resowing of part of the winter crop sowings is allowed to occur. The situation is slightly different now. According to reports from the local level, in the North Caucasus, the Central Chernozem Region, the Ukraine, and a number of other regions winter crops are emerging from the wintering season in a good or satisfactory state. The question now is to ensure the timely tending of every hectare of sowings: to carry out top-dressing and pest and weed control.

In the interests of resolving the grain problem it is important to make full use of the entire potential of this sector. In deciding the structure of sowings, kolkhozes and sovkhozes are called upon to take all their possibilities into account and to sow such areas and such crops as will guarantee the farm's high performance and the unconditional fullfillment of the state order plan for sales of a wide range of grain products. An important role must be assigned to corn in particular. In the Taldy-Kurgan Kolkhoz "40 Let Oktyabrya," contract teams produced up to 112-127 quintals of grain corn per hectare last year. Individual teams on the Don, in the Kuban, and in the Black Sea region are obtaining 100 and more quintals per hectare on irrigated land. However, average indicators for these regions and oblasts are several times lower than those of the pacesetters. Impressive pledges are usually tossed around here in the spring, but when they fail to be fulfilled, party committees do not bother to find out the reasons for the failure and to identify those to blame for the plan nonfulfillment. The USSR Gosagroprom and local agroprom organs have failed to adopt the measures necessary to create zones of guaranteed grain corn production, especially on irrigated land, in the North Caucasus, the Ukraine, Moldavia, and Central Asian republics. The share of this crop on irrigated land here is extremely small, and yields do not exceed 25-30 quintals per hectare. It is necessary to put an end to this situation now. Corn must rightly occupy a worthy place in our country's grain production, and no one can deny it this right.

Shortages prevail in the supplies of hulled crops and pulses, especially buckwheat, to the population. How could it be otherwise if last year even on fields cultivated by intensive techniques in the Ukraine, Moldavia, and Kazakhstan the increase in yields totaled only 3 quintals per hectare? A radical breakthrough is needed in increasing buckwheat production. It is hoped that farm and agro-industrial enterprise managers will finally adopt a serious approach to the solution of the hulled and pulse crops problem and create all the preconditions necessary to increase their yields. Clearly, there is a need to examine the question of better economic incentives for kolkhozes and sovkhozes for increasing the production and procurement of these crops. The same applies to durum, strong, and valuable wheat varieties whose cultivation has become disadvantageous as a result of higher prices for machinery, fertilizers, and plant protection agents.

A hampering factor in the development of grain production is the inadequate provision of farms with material and technical resources. There is a shortage of sprinklers, machines for top-dressing crops, precision seeders, and combined units for the presowing cultivation of soil needed in the cultivation of fields by means of intensive techniques. Enterprises of the Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building, Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building, Ministry of the Production of Mineral Fertilizers, Ministry of Construction, Road, and Municipal Machine Building, Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry, and of other departments have failed to deliver large quantities of new equipment, spare parts, prefabricated grain depots, liming materials, and pesticides to agricultural workers. Scientific establishments are slow in reconstructing their work. They have not done enough to create science-and-production systems and associations and to ensure the efficient assimilation of intensive techniques and contract forms of production organization.

While endeavoring to increase grain production, we must not forget about its economical consumption either. The efforts of agro-industrial complex workers in this sphere must be focused on ensuring the satisfaction of each farm's full requirement for high-grade coarse, succulent, and concentrated feeds from own production and the implementation of measures to ensure a sharp reduction in the consumption of grain per unit of livestock product.

Party committees and primary party organizations on kolkhozes and sovkhozes and in all agro-industrial complex subdivisions are called upon to step up organizational and mass-political work in collectives, gearing it to the solution of specific grain production problems.

Agro-industrial complex workers are laying the basis for the next harvest during this spring season. To achieve the set targets, they will have to increase the grain yields on every hectare on every farm by a minimum of 3-4 quintals in comparison with last year's level. This is a difficult but feasible task. If the pacesetters can achieve higher yields, then all the country's grain farmers can achieve them.

Scientific

'Cosmos-1939' Satellite Launched 20 Apr

LD201358 Moscow TASS in English 1353 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] Moscow April 20 TASS—Another satellite in the Cosmos series, the Cosmos-1939, was launched atop a Vostok booster rocket in the Soviet Union today.

The principal aim of the launching is to obtain day-to-day data by means of a complex of optico-mechanical and optico-electronic scanning means with a view to studying the natural resources of the earth in the interests of various branches of the Soviet economy and international cooperation.

The satellite was put into a solar synchronous orbit with the following parameters:

Initial orbital period—97.6 minutes.

The maximum distance from the earth's surface (in apogee)—678 km.

The minimum distance from the earth's surface (in perigee)—620 km.

Orbital inclination—98 degrees.

The on-board equipment is functioning normally.

Data from board the satellite are being transmitted to the State Research Centre for the study of natural resources and to the regional computing centres of the USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology for processing, utilisation, and dissemination.

Cosmonauts Carry out Astrophysical Studies

LD201937 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] For Cosmonauts Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov, the 4th month of working in near-earth orbit is coming to an end. Today astrophysical studies and geophysical experments are being continued with the help of scientific apparatuses installed on the Mir manned complex. The object of studies with the Roentgen observatory telescope is the supernova in the Great Magellanic Cloud. It is the 2d year that it is shining in the south polar area of the heavenly spheres. Every working session, of which there will be six today, gives modern astrophysics fresh information on the great stellar catastrophe.

Space Program Goals Outlined on Cosmonaut Day

PM210905 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Apr 88 Second Edition pp 1, 3

[TASS report: "Cosmonautics Serves Peace"]

[Text] Cosmonautics Day is celebrated as a great festival of science and labor throughout our motherland. For millions of people in other countries, it has become yet another sign of hope for a peaceful future for planet earth: The Soviet Union was not only a pioneer in space exploration but was also the first to offer other states the opportunity to work in earth orbit for purely peaceful purposes.

Scientists, designers, enterprise and cosmodrome personnel, specialists at the Cosmonaut Training Center and Mission Control Center, Soviet pilot cosmonauts, and representatives of the public assembled on 12 April at the Soviet Army Central Academy Theater to take part in a ceremonial session marking Cosmonautics Day.

The presidium comprised O.D. Baklanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; I.S. Belousov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; leaders of a number of ministries and departments and of the USSR Academy of Sciences; and representatives of party, soviet, and public organizations.

There is perhaps no sector of the country's national economy today where the achievements of cosmonautics are not used to some extent or other, O.A. Korolev, secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom, said when opening the meeting. Concepts like the space industry, space technology, space medicine and meteorology, and space communications and navigation are now normal. Long tours of duty in orbit involving a variety of scientific experiments are also normal now.

A report was delivered to the meeting by V.M. Kovtunenko, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and scientific leader of the G.N. Babakin Scientific Research Center. The speaker's first words were, of course, addressed to those on tour of duty in space orbit that day—Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov. And today, despite the holiday, the crew of the orbital complex is busy at work.

The research and experimental program being carried out on board the manned Mir complex includes astrophysics, medicine, and a whole series of other scientific and national economic areas of cosmonautics. A large part of the crew's work, the speaker reported, is concerned with the program of remote probing of the earth. Hundreds of organizations, ranging from geologists to agronomists, figure among the consumers of this kind of space data. Virtually the entire territory of the Soviet Union south of the 52d parallel is being surveyed, and at various times of the year, from the Mir complex using photographic equipment and spectrometers.

A great deal of the Mir station's work is devoted to space materials technology. The cosmonauts have several technological devices available to them. The crew is not only carrying out pure research work with the aim of further studying the processes of heat mass transfer under conditions of weightlessness but is also engaged in obtaining test specimens of crystals of semiconductor materials with improved characteristics.

The program of biological experiments being conducted during long flights aboard the scientific research complex is continuing to study the development of higher plants, micro-organisms, and other biological forms in conditions of weightlessness. Satellites are also being used for biological research. The results of the experiments carried out last fall aboard the biosatellite Cosmos-1887, which housed monkeys, rats, plants, fish, and other life forms for 2 weeks, have made an important contribution to the sum of our knowledge about the complex interreaction between living organisms and the space environment. Specialists from socialist countries, the United States, France, and the European Space Agency took part in that expedition's program.

The Soviet Union attaches extraordinary importance to international cooperation in space research and rates highly the positive results obtained in this area. We have already celebrated the 20th jubilee of the Intercosmos Program. As part of this program scientists from socialist countries continued last year reseach work into natural resources and the study of the environment based on the use of Soviet space equipment.

Bulgarian specialists are also taking an active part in implementing the program together with scientific organizations and departments from other fraternal states. At present two of that country's citizens are completing training for a joint flight aboard a Soyuz craft and Mir orbital complex. The next flight by an international crew is scheduled for this June. Afghan and French citizens are also at the Yu.A. Gagarin Space Training Center. The international crew including the Afghan cosmonaut will also be launched into space this summer. For the first time an international crew, including a French citizen, will be aboard an orbital complex for a month. This launch is scheduled for late fall.

Last year, the 70th anniversary year of the Great October Revolution, the speaker continued, saw an important event in the development of Soviet cosmonautics—the first use of the Energiya multipurpose heavy-lift launcher. With a launch mass of 2,000 tonnes, it is capable of putting a payload in excess of 100 tonnes into orbit. Energiya can deliver into outer space shuttle vehicles and large pieces of scientific and national economic equipment, including modules for future long-duration orbital stations.

During its relatively short existence, the speaker stressed, cosmonautics has enriched world science with fundamental discoveries and new knowledge about processes occurring on the earth, in near-earth space, on other celestial bodies, and in interplanetary space. Scientists from various countries expect great new things from the next Mars expedition: In July 1988, two Soviet Phobos interplanetary stations, which will be fitted out with sets of scientific equipment created during international cooperation, are going to be dispatched to that planet's satellite.

The study of Mars, which resembles the earth in many respects, is particularly interesting. In terms of geological development it occupies an intermediate position between the earth and the moon. Its study therefore provides a unique opportunity to understand the geological history of earth-type planets, which is of great practical significance for the geology of the earth. Moreover, there are signs of the existence of water in Mars' past and, consequently, a mild climate. This means that we may be able to confirm with scientific facts the hypothesis that dramatic temperature changes occurred on the planets. In addition, Mars clearly remains the sole planet in the solar system where the possibility of discovering signs of extraterrestrial life is not precluded.

Research carried out by astrophysical space observatories is making it possible to solve a broad range of problems that not only form the basis of a modern world outlook, or cosmology, but are of practical significance. Scientists have for the first time, for example, begun speaking about thermonuclear reactions as the energy sources of the stars, and now the problem of controlling these reactions on earth has become a central one in modern physics and energy.

It is astrophysical research, the speaker stressed, that has shown how fragile and unique our terrestrial world is. Exposed to powerful streams of particles and electromagnetic radiation, the world is only protected by the relatively thin layer of the earth's atmosphere. The ozone layer, for example, which screens out harsh ultraviolet rays, is very sensitive to man's industrial activity. As space research in particular has shown, this activity is causing its destruction, particularly over the Antarctic. And what could military activity in outer space, with its very powerful means of affecting not just the ozone layer but the whole atmosphere, bring?

That is why, in 1985, the Soviet Union submitted a proposal to the United Nations "On International Cooperation for the Peaceful Exploration of Outer Space in Conditions of Its Nonmilitarization" and in 1986 put forward the "star peace" program. These documents propose a phased, joint, practical action program for the peaceful exploration of outer space, which could be carried out under the auspices of a world space organization.

It is important to stress here, V.M. Kovtunenko stated, that successful international cooperation in outer space has a beneficial effect on the development of computers, data processing, the transmission of considerable flows of information over long distances, and the creation of new medical equipment. The USSR Academy of Sciences has already done a great deal here—unique instruments allowing accurate research into the composition of various environments, magnetic and electrical fields, streams of charged particles, and the spectral features of radiation in various wave bands. These instruments and techniques developed for space equipment are being increasingly widely used in various kinds of research on earth, and that means that space is beginning to pay the investment back to the inhabitants of the earth.

Radio Biological Tests Under Way Near Chernobyl

LD210853 Moscow TASS in English 0716 GMT 21 Apr 88

[Text] Pripyat (Kiev region) April 21 TASS—TASS special correspondent Ivan Kirillov reports:

Large-scale experiments on radiobiology are carried out in the town of Pripyat, a mere five kilometres away from the Cehrnobyl nuclear power station (NPS) two years after the disaster. Specialists perform the experiments in the town's hothouses on an area of two hectares. The hothouses had been built prior to the NPS breakdown in April 1986.

Following decontamination, it was decided to keep the hot-houses, Nikolay Arkhipov, director of the radiobiological research laboratory, told me. In them biologists got unique conditions for radiobiological experiments.

Anyone entering the hot-house is amazed at the abundance of roses, tulips, and exotic southern flowers. It is difficult to believe that they all have been grown on a radiation-contaminated soil. The contamination level is approximately ten times as high as the natural background. However, its effect on human organism is within permissible norms.

It is difficult to refrain from plucking large strawberries. Arkhipov said: "You may taste it, of course. Our research indicates that the contamination of, say, strawberries or cucumbers, with radioactive elements does not exceed 100 millionths of curie per kilogram. This is the world's established medical norm for foodstuffs".

Following the effective decontamination measures based on the recommendations of radiobiological researchers, the government commission for the elimination of the aftermath of the breakdown of the Chernobyl nuclear power station took a decision on the advisability of returning 30,000 hectares of arable land within the 30 km zone around the nuclear power station into economic uses.

An ecological nature reserve will be set up on the most contaminated areas in direct proximity to the station within the radius of ten km of it—where the natural effect of radiation on animate nature will be monitored.

Transarctic Exploration Continues From Mirny

LD202242 Moscow TASS in English 1704 GMT 20 Apr 88

[Text] Pravda Coast, Antarctica April 20 TASS—TASS special correspondent Nikolay Konstantinov reports:

A caterpillar cross-country vehicle "pingvin" of the Soviet design of the late 50s was put on a pedestal in the Mirny Observatory on Antarctica's Pravda Coast. It has been made a monument to Soviet Polar explorers.

Nearly 80 long-range intercontinental runs have been made over three decades by Soviet Antarctic explorers using specially designed snow-going vehicles. There were expeditions into the area of the south geomagnetic pole and to the pole of relative inaccessibility, a travel over Queen Mary Land.

Most Soviet transantarctic expeditions start from the Mirny Observatory. Each summer units of drillers, glaciologists and geophysicists set out of the Mirny Observatory to "Cupola C" to continue a programme of deep drilling of the glacier with the taking of core samples. A geomagnetic proving ground was set up on "Cupola B" situated at a distance of nearly 2,000 km from Mirny.

Military

Prevalence of Draft-Dodging Attitude Discussed

PM201616 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Apr 88 Second Edition pp 3-4

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA special correspondent Aleksey Khorev "Military Journalist's Notes": "Shirking Responsibility"]

[Text] Life sometimes comes up with interesting stories! Almost 20 years after being drafted into active military service, after traveling a good half of the country, I was suddenly sent to the very same garrison where I began my service as a private in a reserve antiaircraft machinegun regiment. Moreover, I soon moved into an apartment just 500 meters from the spot where our battalion's row of dugouts used to be. Memories came flooding back. On days off I took the children and went to that patch of waste ground where to a stranger there was no trace of the dugouts, but I thought I could pinpoint the outlines of each and say which company was stationed in it, who commanded the company, who was its master sergeant, and what happened there... I recalled a mass of details about my own company and my service, mostly painted in rosy hues and warmed by the nostalgic smile of an adult looking back at his own youth.

Then one day a former regimental colleague with whom I had begun service here in the same platoon dropped by this cherished microrayon to see me. We talked about this and that and recalled our mutual friends. Then I suggested going to the spot where those dugouts had been. I thought he would gladly agree, but he unexpectedly abruptly dismissed the idea:

"I don't want to remember that concentration camp—the wire fence, frozen cabbage, and shooting practice in 30 degrees of frost..."

All this did indeed take place (service never was easy; especially in a reserve regiment during wartime), but we saw it in different ways. The wire fence did not bother me at all because there was nowhere to go. Anyhow, it looked purely symbolic, you could climb over it if you wanted to. We did have frozen cabbage to eat but, first, not all the time, and second, on an empty stomach you would even go back for more. Training in the frost—this was, I think, a real test and, at the same time, it was a toughening up exercise. But now that everything is far behind us, there is no harm in recalling it and, when the opportunity arises, telling young people about it.

But what can a person say to young people that is inspiring about the army when he associates it with a... concentration camp?! Absolutely nothing. We all get our first, most striking, and memorable impression of military service from children's books and from stories told by our fathers, grandfathers, and television and radio storytellers... Unfortunately, not everyone is always lucky with their books and storytellers. This seemingly trivial bad luck sometimes leads to serious consequences. One day I happened to hear these curious words from a youth of draft age:

"The army," he said mischievously, obviously using someone else's words, "is, of course, a school, but it is better to graduate from it as an external student..."

I do not know how his attitude to military service developed thereafter, but it is perfectly possible that he tried to dodge it somehow. I make that assumption because there are quite a few of these "external students" nowadays. Look around and you will easily see this for yourself. There are many men who have reached maturity without ever serving in the army's ranks. Among them there are those who, as it were, would love to, but circumstances prevent them: The law grants them deferment or releases them from the draft for objective reasons which are out of their control—health or family reasons. I am not referring to such people. I am referring to those who "organize" these privileges at any price and who seek them by fair means or foul.

Here is an excerpt from a letter by retired Colonel Aleksandr Karpovich Seledtsov, deputy chairman of the committee to assist the Leninskiy Rayon Military Commissariat in the city of Bobruysk in Mogilev Oblast: "Now there are many encroachments on military service. Some people want to reduce the term of service or make the army professional [nayemnyy], and some parents try in every way to shield their sons from service... The following remark was made recently (6 January 1988) on a television program, as though in jest:

"'If the whole of man's life is a good book, then military service is two pages torn out of this book.'"

Here is a quotation from MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS of 10 March this year: "Until recently we seemingly had no idea that there are some among us who do not want to do military service. One way or another, people have attempted to create the impression that 18-year-olds all dream of military service...

"In fact the picture is not so rosy. Not everywhere, of course. But in cities such as Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, and other major centers, the number of people who dodge military service, unfortunately, is not dropping. Some refuse for religious reasons. Others try to find some 'informal' grounds. And some simply refuse."

Workers at military commissariats say there are a considerable number of young men who try to dodge military service by feigning all kinds of illnesses, including mental ones. This information is quite convincingly confirmed by information, for example, from the Moscow Prosecutor's Office, which investigated crimes of bribe-taking by officials in a number of departments in the USSR Ministry of Health. Some of these people received considerable sums for making bogus diagnoses of mental illnesses conferring release from being drafted into the army. Consequently, there are people who are ready to pay to be labeled schizophrenic. They included, in particular, three draftees and a lieutenant called from the reserve for 2 years (the trial of this case has not yet ended, so I am not mentioning names.)

Schizophrenia is probably one of the most serious illnesses that can afflict a person. "God forbid that I go crazy, I would rather be a beggar," Pushkin said. How far do you have to lose your sense of honor, conscience, decency, and self-respect to agree to such a bogus diagnosis for the sake of being released from the draft? Or let us put the question another way: What kind of distorted impression do you need to have about military service to take such a shameful step to avoid it? One more question: In what circumstances and by whose efforts is such an impression of the army cultivated?

In the 1920's and 1930's our army's reputation was firmly established as a kind of university for millions of young workers and peasants giving them a physical, mental, moral and artistic education. Aleksey Tolstoy said that no other school is capable of doing this on such a massive scale. This was quite correct for that time. There really was no other such school.

The mandatory secondary education which has now become universal and widely accessible higher education were bound to reduce the army's educational functions to some extent. There was a time when peasant sons went away to the Red Army illiterate and returned literate by the standard of those times. Or they were drafted as believers, with crosses in their pockets if not around their necks, and ended up as militant atheists. It was an entire revolution in the person's fate and life—he acquired a new outlook! In addition, the principle of manning the army in those years was based on class—not everyone was taken even if they were suitable from the health standpoint. So the draftee felt he was in a preferential position, and the person who was not drafted felt left out and offended. Women were reluctant to marry the poor fellow: There must be something wrong with him.

Now a lot has changed in the scale of values. While a soldier or seaman learns how to defend the motherland and returns from service with the right to preferential admission to a VUZ, his former classmate whose draft has been deferred for some reason or who has been released from the draft, completes two or three years at an institute and becomes so arrogant that next to him the poor serviceman feels left behind and left out. The classmate who has overtaken him keeps on teasing him: The army, of course, is a school, he says, but it is better to study as an external student...

Ultimately, in the highest sense, the soldiers and the seamen do not lose out, of course. First and foremost, they earn the lifelong moral right to be proud of the fact that they did their service. They can tell their children and grandchildren about this, for example... For some reason they make a point of asking about this and are very disappointed if dad or granddad turns out to have been exempted from military service. But perhaps this is not the main concern. Military service gives servicemen many unflashy but very important qualities for their entire lives.

Here is what reserve Master Sergeant Yuriy Shikov, awarded the lofty title of Hero of the Soviet Union for combat excellence in fulfilling his international duty in Afghanistan, says about this:

"If we are talking about military service as a whole, I don't even know how to put into words the tremendous and significant thing that became part of me. Perhaps I can put it like this: There was an understanding in the loftiest sense of my social duty and internationalism, the force of an order and the force of discipline, military fraternity and the necessity of self-sacrifice, and a new understanding of the sense of love for my country."

Here is what lecturer Boris Nikolayevich Chumakov, a former soldier, now candidate of medical sciences, writes to the editorial office:

"It is my profound conviction that the Soviet Army is a school, it is as necessary to a young man as his mother, as necessary as breathing air is to life.

"Recently I was a participant in an intense discussion. The conversation among a group of medical scientists turned to the fact that many good students were facing the draft, and some people were very aggrieved at this. I objected:

"'So you think that only people who are not gifted or talented, come from large families, and are without pedigree and connections should do military service?'

"I could not restrain myself, I spoke proudly of myself, said, yes, I did military service—as a soldier in the infantry. I crawled, dug, fired, cleaned, was perpetually short of sleep, and saw my contemporaries outside the fence going for moonlight strolls. I am truly sorry for people who have not experienced the ecstasy of drill, singing, and carrying out commands precisely. I do not want to be misunderstood. I am not extolling the draftee, I simply want to speak out according to my civic duty: Military service is an honor, it is a sacred duty, and there can be no other opinions. I am in favor of everyone doing military service without exception. There should be the minimum of contraindications. It is time to revise the directives on health contraindications! As a doctor I say that only invalids can be exempted. No loopholes!"

Of course, there is nothing unusual in this view of military service. It is traditional. This tradition grew and became established during the Great Patriotic War. At that time it was particularly continued and developed in the volunteer movement. Volunteers besieged the military commissariats. Many of them were refused, but they stubbornly tried to get their way.

"Many of my contemporaries went to the front as volunteers," the writer Yuriy Nagibin says, "although they had the right to finish courses at VUZ's. But their conscience made them act as the times required."

Of course, it is easier than anything to object that that was wartime, and nowadays there is no need for such selflessness. But let us note that no one is demanding this of anybody. This is a matter of each citizen carrying out his constitutional duty with elementary honesty. And, besides, alluding to the war still does not explain everything.

In June 1941 one of our citizens handed over his motorcycle valued at R2,600 for the war effort. After victory he obtained monetary compensation for it at the rate of 1:10 (in connection with the reform). He believes this is unfair and has been going to courts for many years. But his suits in various courts, including in the republic's Supreme Court, have been unsuccessful. He grudgingly took the appropriate sum but has not stopped complaining. Today any mention of the wounds sustained by the country because of the war reminds him of his motorcycle—his greatest loss in the entire war.

Do you not agree that this pensioner's complaints look trivial against the background of the nationwide sacrifices and losses? What can be said about Eldar Aleksandrovich Ryazanov, a well-known and respected figure in our culture, who, when asked whether he had served in the army, publicly answered that he had been out when the notification sent him by the military commissariat arrived and the only thing that he remembered about his military training at the institute where he was studying at that time was that when the teacher ordered him to leopard-crawl, he as a student was sorry to get his new suit dirty. What a tragedy... It was recounted more than 40 years later on all-union television. Ryazanov told television viewers the story of the military service of one of his comrades, who allegedly did nothing but wipe the noses of the lieutenant's children and sit them on the pot (incidentally, anyone who knows about the life of army lieutenants will realize that this is utter rubbish).

In OGONEK's last issue Ryazanov complains about the strictness of television editors. But what kind of strictness is it when such pearls are broadcast?

This remark by Ryazanov was criticized in PRAVDA, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, and other publications. Several months have passed since then. Eldar Aleksandrovich has not deemed it necessary to explain himself to readers. They continue to send angry and perplexed letters to the editorial office. Here are some extracts from them.

A. Kopylov: "E. Ryazanov's remarks mock service in the Soviet Army. How could he do such a thing? He obviously felt ashamed to admit that as a perfectly healthy man he dodged the army, shirking his responsibility."

V. Rakhmatullin: "Any information has specific ideological content. This includes E. Ryazanov's remark too, of course. Only what is it aiming at, whose benefit does it serve, and what does it teach young people—evading military service?"

A. Fatkhi: "How could someone suffering from no illnesses and enjoying no legal privilege evade the draft? Legally this is a crime."

Reader R. Tararin, criticizing Ryazanov's talk on television, also cites his interview in the weekly ARGUMENTY I FAKTY: "'There was the business, for example, in the movie 'Mind the Car.' A. Papanov and A. Mironov are playing a scene at a dacha and A. Papanov's hero says: 'Who do you think you are? I am a retired lieutenant colonel and you are an ordinary crook!' A complaint was made to us and we were told to take out 'retired lieutenant colonel.' We did. So he says in the movie: 'Do you know who I am? You are just an ordinary crook!' But since the character still talked in an intimidating tone and made irrelevant soldier's jokes, it was clear nonetheless that he was a retired military man. Strange as it might seem, because we removed this specific reference the audience started to think he was a general or a marshal. So it turned out that we were able to turn this amendment to our advantage' (?!)

"It is incomprehensible why Ryazanov found it necessary to make this offensive and discourteous attack on officers. On what basis does he believe they are jokers? A draftee who knows even less than Ryazanov about military service may believe him. Can he still not forgive the suit which got dirty during his military training? But this is such a trivial matter..."

Here we are close to answering the question of who is trying to cultivate an incorrect impression of the army today along with a cowardly and disparaging attitude to military service and a desire to dodge the draft, sheltering behind someone else. A number of objective circumstances that reduce the attractiveness of service for a certain number of draft-age young people have already been discussed here. But there is also a subjective side to the problem.

Recently a certain tendentiousness has emerged in the depiction of servicemen and their everyday life in certain works of literature and art. Or rather, not so much in works of art as in fleeting statements by individual figures. Either this is a reflection of an unfriendly view of the army, or it is a consequence of the widespread habit in the country of talking first and thinking later. One cannot help thinking about the fundamental difference between criticism of shortcomings in the army and the discrediting of military service.

Issue No 11 of the magazine YUNOST for 1987 published the Yuriy Polyakov story "100 Days to the Order," which was devoted to the depiction of so-called nonregulation relations in the army and was extensively publicized by the author beforehand. It contains no artistic or social discoveries, unless one considers as a discovery the author's scrupulously compiled table of ranks or handbook for learner barrack-room hooligans—a table dividing soldiers up by length of service into those who are "rookies," those who are "streetwise," and so forth. The military press has been writing about the problem dealt with in the story for many years. There have been and continue to be impressive and constructive articles on this subject. Restructuring is being carried out in the army and navy—as it is throughout the country—and a comprehensive offensive against negative phenomena is under way. There have been substantive improvements in overcoming cases of barrack-room hooliganism and in creating a legal and moral atmosphere for refusing to accept such hooliganism in military collectives. But the problem, unfortunately, still remains. Yu. Polyakov's story produces no new approaches toward solving the problem. Rather it sensationalizes matters. Strange as it may seem, it is this sensational aspect that was warmly supported by Vyacheslav Kondratyev in his review entitled "On A Painful Subject" published in the 10 February 1988 edition of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA.

Pointedly avoiding rating the literary standard of the story, the reviewer stresses in every possible way what he sees as its priority and correspondence to actual truth, while making the reservation that he himself obtained his ideas about this truth from the story itself and from reading readers' letters to the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA editorial office... These two sources can hardly be considered adequate grounds for asserting that in today's army things go on that are "simply awful to write about"—"far worse than what happened in seminaries in the past"—that the writer had not heard of such things happening "even among prisoners," and that if the army had officers who "actively stamped out abnormal nonregulation relations this phenomenon would probably not flourish so freely..." One cannot fail to note a kind of phoniness and deliberate oversimplification in the writer's arguments: We may have good doctors, for example, but that doesn't stop people getting ill... But it is not even a question of this vulnerable logic! It is hard to realize how, in making all these deliberately provocative statements, a former frontline soldier and acclaimed military writer could have failed to consider the depressing effect they would have on the young people whose service still lies ahead—would they not try to get out of this "terrible experience" at someone else's expense?

I do not know whether Vyacheslav Kondratyev read many readers' letters to the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA editorial office on this subject. The KRASNAYA ZVEZDA mailbag also contains letters about this, but by no means do all of them say the same thing. Here, for instance, is what Private (Reserve) Khoze Abdulkhamidov from Mangyshlak Oblast says:

"Yes, such nonregulation relations do exist in the army, I've seen them myself. But I've also seen subunits where they do not exist, where order reigns and everything is done in a human way... I've also encountered 'hazers,' but they had a tough time with me—my background is that of a worker. In 2 years of service I have never allowed my human dignity to be belittled and have never belittled anyone else's. I do not consider this to be an achievement. You need only be a man, rather than a mother's boy. And you'll be respected.

"To be honest, I didn't always feel sorry for the 'rookies' who got picked on. Because from the day they arrived some of them boasted out loud about the cushy time they would have."

This is a curious and difficult aspect of the subject... It ought to be studied just like other aspects of the moral maturity (or rather, immaturity!) of many of today's draftees and soldiers. This, of course, is harder than merely making a melancholy and superficial list of cases of barrack-room hooliganism without doing a psychological analysis or interpreting reasons and causes, and with no hint of a constructive approach to education: As people say, "I've done my bit, the rest is none of my business!" It is surprising that this produced nothing but delight in the reviewer along with a naively panicky appeal to solve the problem at one fell swoop, using "immediate measures to put a stop to things."

To be fair, it should be noted that the writer Vyacheslav Kondratyev recalls his own draft service in the army with nostalgic sadness as something bright and good that did a great deal for him and his peers in terms of moral and physical training. The overwhelming majority of current servicemen also have these memories of army service. But from all their contacts with the army some people can only remember a dirty suit, some recall only the lieutenant's snotty-nosed kids, and to some the reserve regiment even seemed like a concentration camp. How are these differing views to be explained? Not only and not so much by possible differences in the specific situation in various units. Our consciousness has a habit of giving a different cast to the stages and events of our biography depending on our moral and psychological preparedness for them, our understanding of their social role, our state of mind... It is well known that everything tastes bitter to someone with a mouth full of bile.

It is, of course, distressing (and not just for the army, but for our entire society!) that for a certain section of draft-age young people military service has started to lose its former attractions and romance. We are convinced that there are both objective and subjective reasons for this. They turn into causes because we underestimate them, we attach no importance to them, we fail to encourage our teenagers to think deeply about the military service that lies ahead, and we do not always succeed—and sometimes do not even deem this necessary—in persuading them of the need for it to safeguard the country's security and of the beneficial effect it has in producing worthy citizens of the fatherland.

A special role here is played by the family. Talking on the subject, an acquaintance of mine said:

"It so happened that I celebrated the recent 70th anniversary of our Armed Forces among slight acquaintances. We drank some fizzy drink and proposed toasts. One guest proposed that we raise our glasses to the future generation of the Soviet Army, pointing to the kids playing in the next room—the host's children—and giving their names. Then the father spoke and expressed the hope that by the time they reach draft age we would no longer have an army... He is probably not the only one whose wishy-washy hopes discourage his growing sons from fighting."

All of us, of course, would very much like a world without weapons. But let us not get ahead of ourselves and lose sight of grim reality by holding out such an idyllic prospect to tomorrow's soldiers. We should neither scare young people nor dampen their enthusiasm. Military service should be the same for them as it was for their fathers and grandfathers: a dream before they are drafted, an honorable and sacred duty during their service, and a proud chapter in their career for the rest of their lives.